

Modern Philology

VOL. III

June, 1905

No. 1

THE DRY SEA AND THE CARRENARE

The Dry Sea and the Carrenare constitute a sort of "dark tower" in Chaucer criticism, and there accordingly attaches at least the melancholy interest of viewing the last of him to each new aspirant who, more or less dauntless, sets the slug-horn to his lips and blows. Yet perhaps it should be said, by way of justifying an attempt predestined, it may seem, to swell the numbers of the lost adventurers, that the solution here to be proposed, if it find confirmation, removes the problem from the sphere of merely curious questions and gives the allusion an unexpected value quite independent of its setting in the poem. For, aside from what appears to be its very intimate relation to the results of recent archaeological discoveries in one of the most interesting quarters of the farther East, and its concrete embodiment of the transition from the geography of fable to the geography of fact; aside, too, from its curious foreshadowing, perhaps, of what a little later turned out to be the romance of the New World, the reference seems to help us to a glimpse, at least, of something which is even more illuminating—the background in space against which, more or less vaguely, the life of Chaucer's century was felt to be projected; the fashion after which men had come to visualize "this litel spot of erthe, that with the see enbraced is." And the possibility that the suggested solution may, if sound, help us toward some such reconstruction, by heightening in a measure our sense of what, through channels other than books, was pouring

into England from a world whose remoter boundaries were even then beginning to stir men's imaginations, makes it seem worth while to venture something in a fresh attempt, even though "the wrastling axeth a fall."

I

It is important to what follows to see precisely how the matter now stands. In the well-known passage Chaucer, or rather the Man in Black, is rehearsing the virtues of the Duchess Blanche. Among them was the sweet reasonableness with which she treated her lovers. She did not try to hold any wight in suspense,

Ne sende men in-to Walakye,
To Pruyse and in-to Tartarye,
To Alisaundre, ne in-to Turkye,
And bidde him faste, anoon that he
Go hoodles to the Drye See,
*And come hoom by the Carrenare.*¹

Briefly stated, the solutions so far offered are as follows. In his *Chaucer's England*,² in 1869, Mr. Rands lightly cut the knot by declaring the lines in question to be "banter, *q. d.*, 'Nor send him to fetch her a pound of green cheese from the moon' Of course the 'dry sea' is an absurdity, it was meant to be so." "Carrenare" he takes "to be bad Italian for carrier, or caravan," the proper word, he remarks, being "*carrettiere*, a carter." The change to *carrettare*, however, "for the sake of the rhyme, is not very outrageous license, compared with other things of the same kind to be found in Chaucer and poets of the time." To this *jeu d'esprit* the retort courteous on Chaucer's behalf was made the next year by Mr. Brae, in an appendix to his edition of the *Treatise on the Astrolabe*³ in which he also took occasion to offer a very ingenious explanation of his own. The Carrenare, he suggests, is the Gulf of Carnaro in the Adriatic—"Il Carnaro, the charnel-hole: so-called because of its reputed destructiveness of human life." The argument, readily accessible in the *Oxford Chaucer*, rests on testimony to the dangerous character of the gulf, and on the assumption (to quote

¹ *Book of the Duchesse*, ll. 1024-29.

² Matthew Browne [W. B. Rands], I, 62.

³ A. E. Brae (London, 1870), pp. 101-5; discussed in the *Oxford Chaucer*, I, 486-88.

Professor Skeat's restatement of the point) that "the true name *Quarnaro* or *Carnaro* was turned by the sailors into *Car-nario*, which means in Italian 'the shambles' This *Carnario* might become *Careynaire* or *Carenare* in Chaucer's English, by association with the M. E. *careyne*, or *caroigne*, carrion." Professor Skeat seems also to accept Brae's suggestion that Dante's allusion to the gulf¹ may have reminded Chaucer of its fatal character. Mr. Brae's explanation of the Dry Sea, however, is not offered, as he frankly says, "with anything like the same confidence" as that of the Carrenare, because—and his reason is still pertinent—"drie sea" is a description so wide and uncertain, and is consequently open to so many different interpretations, that unless some special reference should be discovered to throw light upon it, it is scarcely capable of more than the loosest suggestion." With this caution, the Dry Sea is tentatively identified with the variable Lake of Czirknitz, of which an account occurs, curiously enough, on the same page of Sebastian Munster's *Cosmographie*² wherein he quotes the description of the Carnaro. This lake, says Munster, "in winter time becomes of great extent. But in summer the water drains away the bed of the lake is ploughed up—corn grows to maturity—and, after the harvest is over, the waters return with the approach of winter, [and] the lake is again filled." The notion of the peculiar danger of traversing this lake *hoodless*, Mr. Brae suggests, "may have been popularly current in Italy when Chaucer was there,"³ but he adds with the utmost fairness that "the difficulty is that the same might be said of any arid sandy desert that might metaphorically be called a dry sea." He likewise remarks that a frozen sea might perhaps be so called, and points out that to encounter severe cold *hoodless* seems to have been a feat in amatory chivalry.⁴

¹ *Inferno*, IX, 113.

² Basle edition, p. 1044. It must be remembered, as Mr. Brae himself points out, that this account was written a century and a half after Chaucer. The lake, however, behaves similarly today. See Brae, p. 15; *Oxford Chaucer*, I, 487.

³ Inasmuch as the poem was written three years before Chaucer's first visit to Italy, the connection is not obvious.

⁴ See Warton, *History of English Poetry*, § 18 (ed. Hazlitt, III, 4).

An anonymous review of Brae's book in the same year¹ cites allusions which the writer says (in a passage deemed worthy by Professor Skeat of one bracketed interrogation point and two *sic*'s) "place it beyond doubt that the 'drie see' of Chaucer was the Great Sahara, the return from whence homewards would be by the chain of the Atlas or Carena." These mountains are confidently offered as Chaucer's Carrenare. In 1882 Professor Hales suggested that Mandeville's "Gravelly Sea" in the country of Prester John was surely what Chaucer meant² (an identification to which we shall return); and with Professor Skeat's discussion of the question in his edition of the *Minor Poems*³ the matter rested until a year ago.

The ball was once more set rolling by a note on "Un Passo Oscuro di G. Chaucer," in the first number of the *Journal of Comparative Literature*,⁴ by Professor Torraca, of Naples. After paying his respects to the Lake of Czirknitz—suggesting the unlikelihood that Englishmen of the fourteenth century should have known it, the improbability that so small a lake should have been called a "sea," or that a lake "il quale solo qualche volta reste asciutto" should have been designated as "dry," and finally asking what peril anyway could have confronted English lovers if they *had* obediently made a journey thither—Professor Torraca rightly insists that "le signore solevano constringere gl' innamorati a dar prova di corragio, di audacia in prove difficile." Such a condition, he suggests, would be fulfilled if we suppose Chaucer to have written "*Adrye se o Adrya se, vale a dire: mare di Adria, mare Adriano.*" Brunetto Latini, Dante, Boccaccio called the Adriatic "mare Adriano," and certainly from Lucan's *Pharsalia*, if not from Horace, Chaucer might have known its traditional treachery. *Robur et æs triplex* indeed would have to be, Professor Torraca therefore thinks, about the breast of the English lover who should brave the gales of the Adriatic and then the the rocks and winds of the Quarnaro. The Quarnaro, he further believes, Chaucer must have owed to Dante—an inference pointing

¹ *Saturday Review*, July 30, 1870, p. 143 (Vol. XXX, No. 770).

² *Academy*, January 28, 1882, p. 65 (No. 506).

³ In 1388; republished in 1894 in the *Oxford Chaucer*, I, 487.

⁴ Vol. I, No. 1 (January-March, 1903), pp. 82-84.

to Chaucer's knowledge of the great Italian writers before his first Italian journey in 1372.

This note of Professor Torraca's called out from Mr. Paget Toynbee, in the *Modern Language Quarterly* for April, 1904,¹ the statement that he had proposed the same solution just fifteen years ago to Professor Skeat, who had replied that the suggestion had been already made, but that he had left all such things out because he could not find any evidence except against them. "Thus we should expect either *Ádrie* or *Ádriatic*; the accent on *Adríje* is not very likely. Again, I can nowhere find any mention of *Hadria* in any M. E. author."² Such a reference, however—and a very important one—was supplied in the October number of the same periodical³ by Mr. A. C. Paues from a *Fourteenth Century Biblical Version* soon to be published by the Cambridge University Press: "Bot efter þo fourtene nyghte was comen, and we wore schippande in *A-drye*, aboute þo mydde-nyghte þo schipmen supposed pat þei see a contre."⁴ Referring to the rarity of the name as implied in Professor Skeat's statement, Mr. Paues goes on: "This very fact helps us to understand how the Chaucerian reading came about. The scribe found in the original *the a drye see*; now, since the name *a-drye* was unknown to him, the phrase appeared mere nonsense. He evidently took *the* and *a* to be articles, and emended the text by omitting the less suitable, hence *the drye see*." The thing, however, to be kept distinctly in mind is that it is Torraca and Toynbee and Paues, and not the scribe, who as a matter of fact are emending! Should an actual Dry Sea present itself, the need of such an emendation would of course be obviated.⁵

¹ Vol. VII, No. 1, pp. 15, 16.

² The Carnaro identification Toynbee apparently accepts, but points out abundant possibility of Chaucer's acquaintance with the gulf without the aid of Dante.

³ Vol. VII, p. 100 (October, 1904).

⁴ Acts 27: 27. "A-drye (the capital is my own,)" continues Mr. Paues, "is the reading of the three MSS in which the above text occurs."

⁵ It happens that I am able to add another Middle English mention of Hadria. In an old itinerary in *Purchas his Pilgrims* (London, 1625), II, 1237, occur the following lines:

. . . . thenne,
From Venece what so thou come,
Is ever more *Mare Adriaticum*.
That is to saie in our Englishe
The grete See of *Adrian* I wis.

Purchas (p. 1230) remarks that "the author is unknowne and his time: which yet is likely

The matter, then, stands thus: For the Dry Sea we have as rival claimants the Lake of Czirknitz, the Sahara Desert, the "Gravelly Sea" of Mandeville, and the Adriatic; in the case of the Carrenare the Gulf of Carnaro seems to hold an uncontested field. But before an addition may be ventured to the list, the passage itself demands close scrutiny.

II

Two things, now, are absolutely fundamental to any adequate investigation of the problem: first, to ascertain the text of the two lines in question; second, to determine their exact relation to the context. As regards the text, two points are to be noted. In the first place, all the manuscripts read, in l. 1028, "in-to" instead of "to;" "to" is Professor Skeat's emendation.¹ But the matter is altogether unimportant, so far as the meaning of the passage is concerned,² and Professor Skeat's emendation is probably correct. The second point connected with the text, however, is of more consequence. The mysterious place-name at the close of l. 1029 is uniformly given in the manuscripts and the editions as *Carrenare*—that is, with *-e*. It rhymes with *ware* of the next line. But the *-e* of this *ware* demands instant challenge, for the adjective is not a genuine plural.³ The lines read:

And bidde *him* faste, anon that *he*
Go hoodles to the Drye See
And seye, "*Sir*, be now right *ware*
That I may of *yow* here seyn
Worship, or that *ye* come ageyn."

to have been about two hundred yeares since: Sir Robert Cotton's rich Librarie hath yeeled the Manuscript, whence it was copied." I have been unable to identify the MS in the catalogue of the Cottonian collection.

¹ See *Oxford Chaucer*, I, 312.

² See *New English Dictionary*, s. v. "into," 12. Two examples will here suffice. The first is from *Lazamon* (vs. 4298): "Belin zef his leue broþer anne dal of his lond . . . to halden nord *in to* þare se" (*N.E.D.*, loc. cit.). The second is from Robert of Gloucester, where it is said of Lear that "At þe laste in sorwe ynow *in to* þe se he wende" (l. 797). To assert that Chaucer ever uses "into" in this sense of *usque ad* would, however, be hazardous. In certain passages (such, for instance, as one or two of those quoted on p. 18) the preposition may perhaps be so interpreted. But the point is without bearing on the identification of the Dry Sea, and in the present instance it is quite possible that "in-to" has crept into l. 1028 from ll. 1024-26.

³ It is clear that there is here no question of derivation. The word is from A.S. *war*, and does not occur in the list of "adjectives which in Anglo-Saxon end in a consonant, [but which] sometimes or always take *-e* in the *Troilus*" (*Kittredge, Observations on the*

There is no question, then, that the *yow* and *ye* are singular in sense. Even if the adjective were a genuine plural, however, the reading might still be *war* without the *-e*.¹ But where it is not a real plural, there can be no question that Chaucer's prevailing, if not his exclusive, usage is the form without *-e*.² And if one examine his rhymes, one finds not a single other case of *ware* in rhyme, whereas *war* occurs repeatedly.³ In the light of all these facts, there can be no doubt that the reading in the present instance should be *war* without the *-e*. But with its *-e* must go that of its rhyme-word, and it follows that the name we are concerned with is not *Carrenare* but *Carrenar*, and that the lines must read:

Go hoodles to the Drye See,
And come hoom by the *Carrenar*;
And seye, "Sir, be now right *war*," etc.

The text thus established, its relation to the context demands close scrutiny. The one unmistakable thing about the passage is that it rises in the last two lines into a climax, and a climax primarily of *distances*, at that. That this is the emphasis becomes at once clear, if greater clearness than Chaucer's own be possible, when one compares the corresponding lines in Machault's *Dit du lion*, from which (especially if the reference in the "retracciouns" to *The Book of the Leoun* be authoritative) we may feel pretty sure that Chaucer got the suggestion for the present passage.

Language of Chaucer's Troilus, §49), or in the *Legend* (Manly, *Observations on the Language of Chaucer's L. G. W.*, §49). It is specifically included by Professor Manly in the list of adjectives, "which take no *-e* in *L. G. W.*" (§49, n. 2).

¹"Monosyllabic adjectives standing in the predicate do not always take *-e* in the plural."—Kittredge, *op. cit.*, §69; cf. Child, *Observations on the Language of Chaucer*, §41; ten Brink, *Chaucer's Sprache und Verskunst*, §234. See, for example, *Troilus*, I, 635: "wyse men ben war by foles."

²"So [i. e., the statement of §69 quoted in n. 1 above] particularly when the adjective in the predicate refers to a subject *ye* (expressed or implied) used in a singular sense."—Kittredge, *op. cit.*, §69 (b). See the examples there given; especially, for *war*, *Troilus*, III, 1180: "beth wel war ye do no more amis"; B. 3281: "Beth war by this ensample." I have not found an instance of the adjective *war* in Chaucer, singular or plural, that has certainly *-e*.

³It rhymes with the proper names *Balthasar* (B. 3373, 3375) and *Cesar* (*Lep.* 592, 593), each once; with the noun *char*, twice (*Troilus*, III, 1702, 1704; B. 3798, 3800); and with the strong preterites *bar*, three times (A. 157, 158; G. 1264, 1265; B. 3798, 3803) and *to-tar*, once (B. 3798, 3801). That is, I believe, an exhaustive list. It is worth noting that, in spite of the opportunity offered by *Pandare*, there is no instance of *ware* in rhyme in the *Troilus*.

Machault's lines depict the claims of the rival lovers, who come to take leave of their ladies :

Et quant venoit au congié prendre,
 Il n'estoient pas à aprendre.
 Ains disoient : Savez comment,
 Ma dame, à vous me recommant.
 Vous povez seur moy commander
 Et moy penre, sans demander :
 Car vostre sui entièrement
 Pour faire vo commandement
 A tant s'en partoient de la.
 Après chascuns disoit : Vela
 Celui qui vainqui la bataille
 Entre Illande et Cornuaille.
 L'autre disoit : Par Saint Thomas!
 Mais plus il revient de Damas
 D'Anthioche ou de Damiette
 Et d'Escauvaire ou Dieu Mori
Tout droit, et de Jherusalem.
 Dieu pri qu'il le gart de mal an!
 Car s'il vit, s'iert ans Alexandres.
 —Aussi fust il en Alexandres,
 Dit l'autre, et ou mont de Synay.
 —Et l'autre disoit : Si n'ay
 Homme, qui à li se compert,
 Ne dont tant de bien nous appert ;
Car il fu jusqu'à l'Arbre sec,
Où li oisel pendent au bec.
 Et quant les dames en oioient
 Le bien dire, et si li trouvoient,
 Plus les en devoient par droit
 Enchiérir selonc leur endroit.¹

This piquant dialogue at once recalls the "gabs" in the *Pilgrimage of Charlemagne*, each going the other one better, and the spirit of the thing is, indeed, the same. In Machault's lines, however, it is the *Dry Tree* (on which the lover's inspired imagi-

¹ *Œuvres*, ed. Tarbé, pp. 41, 42. The passage has been briefly referred to by Professor Skeat in the *Oxford Chaucer*, I, 496. An *Amiral d'outre l'Arbre-Sec* ("as it were of 'the Back of Beyond,'" Yule remarks) occurs in an Old French play slightly earlier than the time of Marco Polo, called *Le Jus de St. Nicolas* (*Marco Polo*, ed. Yule-Cordier, I, 132; for bibliography of the *Arbre sec*, see pp. 123-39 and index, and add Alfred Bassermann, "Veltro, Gross-chau und Kaisersage," in *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, XI [1902], 41 ff.)

nation sees also the barnacles hanging by their beaks)¹ that throws the *sis cink*; in Chaucer's, it is the Dry Sea (which without much doubt, we may suppose, Machault's *Arbre sec* called to his mind) together with the Carrenar; in both, it is far countries that are the counters of the game. For what the ladies who *did* hold their suitors "in balaunce" demanded, it is clear, was that their lovers should ride or go "as fer as cercled is the mappe-mounde." Nothing short of the "no man ferre" that even Chaucer's modest Knight attained, was praise enough. Were there no other objections to the Lake of Czirknitz, or the "Adrye See" and the Gulf of Carnaro, the implications of the climax would, I think, be fatal. "Go to Wallachia, to Prussia, to Tartary, to Egypt, to Turkey; nay even, under strict injunction, go—just over the edge of Italy!" That way lies the *ridiculus mus*. From the very structure of the passage itself, accordingly, neither Dry Sea nor Carrenar is to be looked for this side Wallachia, Prussia, Tartary, Alexandria, Turkey, but beyond. It is the *flammantia moenia mundi* with which we have to do—"straunge strondes" at the outposts of the world. And the logic of the lines themselves would bid us look either north, past Prussia; or south, past Alexandria; or, past Wallachia and Turkey, east, beyond the bounds of Tartary.

This preliminary clearing of the ground has seemed absolutely necessary to the further investigation of the problem. We may come now "to the grete." For on the very borderland of Chaucer's world lie both a Dry Sea and a Carrenar.

III

In the *Academy* for January 28, 1882,² Professor Hales referred to Mandeville's famous "Gravelly Sea" in the country of Prester John, and, quoting part of Mandeville's description, remarked: "Here is 'a dry sea' with a vengeance. Surely, this is what Chaucer means."³

I think there is good reason to believe that this both was and

¹See the parallel passage from the *Image du monde* of Gautier de Metz, quoted in Warner's *Mandeville* (Roxburghe Club), p. 213.

²No. 508, p. 65; reprinted in *Folia Litteraria*, p. 86.

³Professor Skeat (*Oxford Chaucer*, I, 488) rejected this suggestion in favor of Mr. Brae's, which, he says, "is probable . . . and suffices."

was not what Chaucer meant. That what was once the strange sea in the land of Prester John was in his mind when he wrote, there is, perhaps, little room to doubt; but that it had even then crossed the borderland between the fabulous and the real, and had pretty definitely localized itself, there is interesting evidence of no small weight, nor is what seems to have happened here without wider significance. Fabulous enough the story surely is when we first meet it, a century and a half before Mandeville, in the numerous texts and versions of the famous *Epistola Presbyteri Johannis*,¹ the uninterpolated text of which later served as the main source of Mandeville's story of the country of Prester John,² as it also underlay in part the fantastic itinerary of Johannes Witte de Hese in 1389.³ In all of these, except the fragmentary

¹ For a thorough and critical presentation of the texts and versions of the *Epistola* see the important work of Friedrich Zarncke, *Der Priester Johannes* (Leipzig, 1876-79): Part I, in Vol. VII of the *Abhandlungen der phil.-hist. Classe der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, No. 8; Part II, in Vol. VIII, No. 1; the promised Part III was never published. This work includes the substance of Zarncke's previous studies in five *Universitätsprogrammen* of 1874, 1875. In the *Berichte der Kgl. Sächs. Gesellschaft* for 1877, pp. 111-56, Zarncke gives the text of the Hildesheim and Cambridge MSS, and in the *Berichte* for 1878 pp. 41-46, he prints the fragment of the English version. By far the best brief summary of the whole matter is that of Yule, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (9th ed., XIX, pp. 714-18), in his article on "Prester John." See also Oppert, *Der Presbyter Johannes in Sage und Geschichte* (Berlin, 1870), and Yule's discussion (in his *Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Cordier, I, 231-37) of Bruun's *The Migrations of Prester John*. See, too, Warner's *Travels of Sir John Mandeville* (Roxburghe Club), p. 215. From the above sources further bibliographical information may be readily obtained. For convenience of reference, in what follows Zarncke's *Der Priester Johannes*, Parts I and II, will be designated as "Z.I" and "Z.II" respectively. The *Epistola* itself, belonging to the last half of the twelfth century (Z.I, 878) is extant in about one hundred MSS (Z.I, 908, cf. 874), which fall into six groups, one containing the uninterpolated text (Z.I, 877), the other five distinguished by the character of their respective interpolations (Z.I, 881-908; for the complete text, interpolations and all, see pp. 909-34). There are also five Middle High German versions: the Berlin MS (Z.I, 947-55; also, in part, in Oppert, *op. cit.*, pp. 27 ff.); the Ambras-Wiener MS (Z.I, 955-68); *Der jüngere Titirel*, vss. 6031-6158, ed. Hahn (Z.I, 968-93); the Munich MS (Z.I, 993-1004); and the Heidelberg MS (Z.I, 1004-28). There are also French (Z., *Berichte*, 1877, p. 112; *Renunciationsprogram*, 1874, pp. 18-20; Paulin Paris, in *Histoire littéraire*, XXI, 797-802) and Italian (Z., *Berichte*, 1877, p. 113; *Renunciationsprogram*, p. 20) versions, and a fragment of one in English (Z., *Berichte*, 1878, pp. 41-46; cf. Z. I., 890-92).

² See Z. II, 132, 133; Bovenschen, *Untersuchungen über Johann von Mandeville und die Quellen seiner Reisebeschreibung* (Berlin, 1888), p. 302; Warner's *Travels of Sir John Mandeville* (Roxburghe Club), p. 215. Mandeville's account of the Prester John country is given in Z. II, 132-38 (English text), 139-46 (Latin text), 147-54 (fifteenth-century German text of Otto von Diemerigen), 181-84 (French text). See *Travels of Sir John Mandeville* (ed. Warner, Roxburghe Club, 1889), pp. 133 ff., for critical English and French texts of the same passages; and for English text alone, *Travels*, ed. Halliwell (1839), pp. 270 ff.; ed. Ashton (1887), pp. 187 ff.; ed. Layard (1895), pp. 335 ff., etc.

³ Z. II, 159-71. See also the twelfth-century account of India by Elyseus (Z. II, 120-27), and that in the anonymous twelfth-century letter concerning the patriarch John of India (Z. I, 831 ff.).

Heidelberg manuscript, the marvelous sea appears, in an even more marvelous environment. Passing the latter for a moment, let us come to the sea itself.

In the uninterpolated Latin text it is described as follows:

Inter cetera, quae mirabiliter in terra nostra contingunt, est *harenosum mare* sine aqua. Harena enim movetur et tumescit in undas ad similitudinem omnis maris et nunquam est tranquillum. Hoc mare neque navigio neque alio modo transiri potest, et ideo cuiusmodi terra ultra sit sciri non potest. Et quamvis omnino careat aqua, inveniuntur tamen juxta ripam a nostra parte diversa genera piscium ad comedendum gratissima et sapidissima, alibi nunquam visa.¹

Three elements in this description of the *mare arenosum* concern us here—its name, the movement of its sands, its impassability and vast extent.²

The names of the sea are not without suggestion. In the Cambridge text it is “quoddam *mare pulvereum* sine aqua,”³ while the versions and the pseudo-travelers name it variously. The French version, like the Cambridge text, has “une *mer de pourre sans aigue*”;⁴ the English has “pe *sandy see*.”⁵ In the German it is

. . . . ein mer, daz ist vol sandes
vnd hat wazzers nirgen ein tran;⁶

it is

. . . . ein mere in vnnserm lannde
wan von ainualltigem sande;⁷

¹ Z. I, 914, §31 (see variants on p. 928); given also in *Œuvres de Rutebeuf*, ed. Jubinal (1839), II, 447. The text in Oppert, *op. cit.*, p. 172, has “quoddam mare sine aqua.”

² The curious detail of the fishes there is here no space to follow out. The writer of the Berlin MS cuts the knot by making a second sea:

Da gegen an der andern siten stat
Ein groz mer, daz hat
den aller besten visch
der ie quam vñ herren tisch (Z. I, 951).

Johannes de Hese adds the picturesque detail that “in illo mare capiuntur pisces *per monoculos, qui intrant pedestes*” (Z. II, 164). The barefaced statement of the Egerton MS of Mandeville—“I Iohn Maundeuell ete of þam, and þarfore trowez it, for sikerly it es soth” (ed. Warner, p. 134)—is not in the French text or the Cotton MS (ed. Warner, p. 215). Cf. the wonderful fishing stone in Z. I, 916, §18.

³ Z., *Berichte*, 1877, p. 143. It is, however, called *mare arenosum* in §20 of the same text (p. 140), and twice in the kindred Hildesheim text (pp. 122, 126).

⁴ *Œuvres de Rutebeuf* (ed. Jubinal, *Bibliothèque Elzevirienne*, 1875), III, 364; ed. Jubinal (1839), II, 461.

⁵ Z., *Berichte*, 1878, p. 45.

⁶ Berlin MS, Z. I, 951, §31.

⁷ Ambras-Wiener MS, Z. I, 962, §31.

it is "ein santwasser."¹ Above all, in *Der jüngere Titurel*² we read:

Dā bi sō ligt besunder gar āne wazzer trucken
Ein mer . . .

to whose "al trucken tobender unde" later reference is made,³ so that at least to the poet of the Grail story the Sandy Sea of Prester John was undoubtedly the *Dry Sea*.⁴ That it might likewise have been so called by Chaucer is obvious.

But if the matter rested there, one might indeed echo Boccaccio's exclamation at the close of his laborious etymologizing of the name of another sea: "Verum haec superflua curiositas est!"⁵

¹ Munich MS, Z. I., 998, §31.

² *Ibid.*, 977, §31. It should be said at this point that in Albrecht von Scharfenberg's *Titurel* the letter of Prester John is woven directly into the story of the wanderings of the Grail to the Orient. On account of the growing sinfulness of those about it, the Grail must leave Salvaterra. By land it reaches Marsilje, whence over a quiet sea it sails to Pitimontes. From there it passes to the Magnetic Mountain, where the wrecks of a thousand ships are lying; before it the power of the magnet is broken. It comes into the Lebermeer (see pp. 43-45) "von kieln gar gesteket und bestanden"; before the Grail the Lebermeer dissolves like ice in fire. After more wandering, Parsival and his companions reach India, where Feirefiz comes rejoicing to meet them. There is, however, no temple in India for the Grail. But now Feirefiz tells (and his speech is simply a translation of the *Epistola*) of the power and glory of Prester John, who thereupon comes himself to meet the Grail. Into the account of the miraculous transportation of the Grail temple to India and the later relations of Parsival and Prester John, there is here no need to enter. See, for Feirefiz's speech, the long extract in Zarncke (I, 968 ff.); for the whole story, *Der jüngere Titurel*, ed. Hahn, st. 5964 to end. I have availed myself of the excellent summary in Conrad Borchling, *Der jüngere Titurel* (Göttingen, 1897), pp. 100-106.

³ *Ibid.*, §33.

⁴ It is also worth noting that, while Odoric's "Sandy Sea" is in the French text "*la mer sablonneuse*" (ed. Cordier, in *Recueil de Voyages*, X, 45), in the addition of Ramusio B the "*mar Sabbionoso*" is "un' arena asciutta, et al tutto priua d'humore" (*ibid.*, p. 47; cf. Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither*, I, 52. See *ibid.*, p. 25, note, for the details peculiar to the Minor Ramusian version, and pp. 21-41 for bibliography).

In Mandeville's Latin text it is "*magnum mare arenosum, quod de sola minuta arena sine ulla aqua cum lapillorum granellis currit et fluit per altas elevationes et depressiones ad similitudinem maris aquae nec unquam quiescit*" (Z. II, 145). In the French text it is "*la mer arenouse, qest tout dareine et de grauelli saunz goutte deauwe*" (ed. Warner, p. 134; cf. Z. II, 182); Otto von Diemerigen has "*eyn sandtmer; das ist eyne mer von ytelm flissendem sande bedeket, unnd ist des sandes also vil unnd als ungrundig, das man nicht weis vorwar, ab dar wasser undir ist adir nicht*" (Z. II, 152); in the English it is "*pe Grauelly See*" (ed. Warner, p. 134). It should be noted that the "Gravelly Sea" is twice elsewhere mentioned in Mandeville: once in the description of the river Belyon, near Acon, whose gravel is shining, "and men makes þeroff gude glasse and clere," of which it is said that "sum saise þat it es a swelgh of þe Grauelly See [une espiral de la Meer Arenouse]," ed. Warner, p. 16; again where the city of Beth in Persia is said to be "a day iournee fra þe Grauelly See" (*ibid.*, p. 75). That Mandeville borrowed his account of the "Gravelly Sea" from the *Epistola*, and not, as Dr. Hales (*loc. cit.*) and Colonel Yule (*Cathay*, I, 28) suggest, from Odoric, is quite clear.

⁵ *De Maribus*, of the Pontus. It is very curious that in the *De Maribus* Boccaccio also describes a veritable "Dry Sea." It is a place in *Numidia*, "in quo spinae piscium muricum

The other two characteristics of the Sandy Sea advance us farther. The description, in the Latin text, of the *moving sands* has already been quoted,¹ and is elaborated in certain versions of the *Letter*:

Ez wehet mit der vlut
als ein ander wazzer tut:
nimmer en wirt ez stille.²

In the English Mandeville "it ebbez and flowes as pe grete see duse in oþer cuntreez with grete wawes, and neuermare standez still withouten mouyng."³ In Johannes de Hese it is "arena fluens ut aqua, crescens et decrescens."⁴ The curious *moving or flowing* of the sand is, indeed, the central point in the description.

But with equal emphasis it is at first insisted that over this sea one cannot pass, and that what lies beyond it no man knows.⁵

ostreorumque; fragmenta saxa attrita uti fieri solent assiduo maris motu; infixae praeterea cautibus ancorae et alia plura testantia ibidem iam mare et portuosum etiam fuisse nil fidei minuent solo: cum nil herbidum alet."—*De montibus, sylvis, fontibus, etc.*, bound with the Tieknor copy of the *Genealogia deorum* (Venice, 1472), in the Harvard Library.

¹ P. 12, n. 4; cf. "et reddit undas sicuti aliud mare et numquam est in quiete" (Camb. text).

² Berlin MS. Cf. also:

vnd wüetet (?) doch nacht vnd tag
als es goraiche (?) von wazzer sey,
vnd tobet ze allen weylen dabey,
in dhainer stille es nymmer wirt,
die starchen winde es dicke pirt (Ambras-Wiener MS).

Daz selbe mer ist swinde, mit sturm in ouden varende;
swenn ez zerblent die winde, daz mer von sant ist tobender ände niht sparende,
und wellen höh sam af dem wazzerwäge (Tituel).

³ Ed. Warner, p. 134. For the Latin and German see particularly p. 12, n. 4. The French has: "et vait et vient as grandes undes auxi come lautre mer fait, et nulle foitz ne nul saison ne se tient toy [coy] ne paisible" (ed. Warner, p. 134; cf. Z. II, 182).

⁴ Z. II, 164.

⁵ What a phantasmagoria lies about this sea, nothing short of the *ipsissima verba* can make clear. The Fountain of Youth is near it, varying its taste every hour through the day and night, where are the stones *nudiosi*, which the eagles carry off to render still more clear their sight (*ad consolacionem sui luminis et vitae*)—the stones which worn on mortal fingers clarify the vision and even, *legitimo carmine consecrati*, render the wearer invisible. Into the Sandy Sea itself flows, three days of the week, a river of stones without water, impassable while its flow continues. Beyond it lies another river, whose sands are mere precious stones; or sometimes this River of Gems flows *through* the Sandy Sea, and is indeed the Sabbatic River, flowing six days and resting the seventh, which keeps the ten tribes of the Children of Israel from crossing into the land of Prester John. And in one part of the desert where the sea lies is a people with round feet, like horse's hoofs; and in another part is the land of Femenye itself—"ane land callit þe vemenland, quhar þair is na man nor na man dar byd our ane þeir . . . and quhen þai pleiss till ride one þair inimeiss, þai ar ane hundretht thousand ridand ladeis witht out þame þat passis one fut. . . . And þai ar werray stark and eruel." And on the other side of the sea are "*medicinae, quae bonae sunt ad potandum*," and in the sea the *monoculi* go a-fishing. The Castle of Gog and Magog is not far away, and the Land of Melliflor—and the lover who reached it would surely win worship "or that he came again"!

It is

ein mer, daz obe und under niht wan griez, darûz gënt nebel rucken
vil dicke, grôze kiel noch barke swebende,
wan niht darûber ist varnde klein noch grôz, daz âf der erd ist
lebende
und wâ daz mer hab ende, daz lâze gar diu werlt sunder frâge.¹

Even the Latin Mandeville has it so: "Nullo tamen humano ingenio valet hoc mare transvadari vel navigari . . . sed nec propter sui longitudinem et plura illic impedimenta de prope circui." But, beginning with certain versions of the *Epistola* itself, there are hints of something else. In the Cambridge MS we read: "Et illud mare nemo potest transire . . . et nos habemus alia passagia, per quae possumus visitare terras nostras."² There is, then, a route round it. And with the German Mandeville, a few years after Chaucer, another new element has come in. In Otto von Diemeringen it is said that the sea is "eyn gar grosz wyt mer, unnd weis nymandt, wo is wende adir was an gensit sey. Unnd das mer czût sich dar bis an dy deserte von Indien, das nymand da hin kommen mag."³ But now the plot thickens. For in this desert, thus specifically connected with the Sandy Sea, are, to use the English version, "many wyld men with hornes apon paire heueds; and pai dwelle in wodes as bestez and spekez nozt, bot gruntils as swyne duse And pare er fewles also spekand of paire awen kynde; and pai will hails men pat com purgh pe desertez, spekand als openly, as pai ware men." Still more explicit is the Latin text: "Et quaedam ex istis naturaliter loquuntur verba aut proverbialia seu salutationes in patriae ydyomate, ut evidenter salutes concedant et reddant viatoribus et nonnunquam debitum

¹ *Der jüngere Titurel*, §§ 31, 32, Z. I, 977. Cf. the vivid statements of the Berlin, Ambras-Wiener, and Munich versions.

² Z. II, 145. So in English: "Dat see may na man passe, nowþer by schippe ne oþer wyse; and þerfore it es unknowen till any man whatkyn land or cuntree es on þe toþer syde of þat see" (ed. Warner, p. 134). The French agrees.

³ Z., *Berichte*, 1877, pp. 143, 144; cf. Hildesheim text, *ibid.*, p. 126: "Sciatis eclaim, quod habemus passagium per mare"—which is, however, manifestly corrupt. The French version (Rutebeuf, III, 364) has: "Et pour ce ne puet nus om savoir combien nostre tierre est grans, fors nous ki l'avons toute en escrit; et si avons autre passage par où nous poons toute nostre tiere visiter." Cf. especially the Munich MS: "Nie für uns das wasser ist frey," etc.

⁴ Z. II, 152.

iter errantibus per desertum ostendant." What we have so far, then, is a sea which not only well might have been, but actually was, called *dry*; whose sands moved and flowed like the other sea; which was impassable from its vast extent; and which reached to a desert wherein were wild men and voices of birds or devils that mocked travelers who had wandered from their way. What and where was the thing which is thus described?

Where the first writer of the *Letter* imagined that it was, no man can tell; the realms of Prester John were as elastic as the pages of "myn auctour Lollius." But starting from whatever lost but real experience of the terrors of the desert, and hovering as it had for centuries over the three Indias, the definite association which, with practical certainty, the Sandy Sea had gained by Chaucer's time seems clear enough. For from even Chinese "time immemorial" the region about Sa-tcheu, on the edge of the great desert of Lop or Gobi, had been known as *Lew-Sha*, the "Flowing Sands."² As the "Moving Sands" it is marked on a Chinese map of the Hsia dynasty (2205-1818 B. C.) and on one of the Chow dynasty (1122-660 B. C.).³ Moreover, the deluding voices are likewise associated with the Gobi in old Chinese records. Ma Twan-lin informs us that there were two roads from China westward: the one long and easy, the other across "a plain of sand *extending for more than one hundred leagues*. . . . During the passage of this wilderness you hear sounds, sometimes of singing, sometimes of wailing; and it has often happened that *travelers going aside to see what these sounds might be have strayed from their course and been entirely lost*;

¹ They move like a will-o'-the-wisp over the old maps—by the Northern Sea, off from the rampart of Gog and Magog, beyond the land of Ophir, on the meridian of Babylon, in the heart of Africa, "ab ostio Gadis per meridiem usque ad fluvium Auri." See Santarem, *Histoire de la cartographie* (Paris, 1849), III, pp. xx-xxi, 10, 195, 240, 295, 296, 333, 370, 390, 436, and the maps themselves in the accompanying *Atlas*. Cf. Behaim's map in Ghillany, *Geschichte des Seefahrers Ritter Martin Behaim* (Nürnberg, 1853). See, too, Yule's *Encyclopædia Britannica* article.

² The Archimandrite Palladius, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, North China Branch*, Vol. X, 1876, p. 4; cf. *Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Yule-Cordier, I, 198; cf. particularly Otto von Diemerding's *fissendem sande*, p. 12, n. 4 of the present article.

³ In Oxenham's *Historical Atlas of the Chinese Empire* (Royal Geographical Society, 1898). For Tun-Huang (the same as Sa-tcheu) in the Moving Sands district, see the map of the Han dynasty, and many later ones. Cf. Yule-Cordier, I, 198; Bretschneider, *Medieval Researches*, II, 18. According to Palladius, in Chinese traditions the name occurs earlier than that of Sha-mo, the sandy region of Mongolia (*op. cit.*, p. 4).

for they are voices of spirits and goblins."¹ Hiuen Tsang, "the Indian Pausanias," who crossed the desert more than twelve centuries ago, had "visions of troops marching and halting, . . . constantly shifting, vanishing, and reappearing, 'imagery created by demons.'"² The legends of the wild men, moreover, still persist, for in 1892 Mr. Rockhill's native guide told him that near Sa-chou were wild men, whose home he placed between the Sa-chou and the Lob Nor.³

The moving, flowing sands, the vast extent, the terrors of the passage, the mocking creatures of the desert, in the Chinese accounts are all in harmony with the distinctive features of the Sandy Sea.⁴ But there is European testimony too. For Marco Polo crossed this very desert of Lop, and this is what he wrote:

The length of this Desert is so great that 'tis said *it would take a year and more to ride from one end of it to the other*. And here, where its breadth is least, it takes a month to cross it. *'Tis all composed of hills and valleys of sand*.⁵ . . . But there is a marvellous thing related of this Desert, which is that when travellers are on the move by night, and one of them chances to lag behind or to fall asleep or the like, when he tries to gain his company again he will hear spirits talking, and will suppose them to be his comrades. Sometimes the spirits will call him by name; *and thus shall a traveller oftentimes be led astray so that*

¹ Quoted in Yule-Cordier, I, 201.

² *Ibid.*, I, 202; cf. Stein, *Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan* (London, 1903), xiv, index, s. v. "Hiuen-Tsiang."

³ Rockhill, *Mongolia and Thibet* (Smithsonian Institution, 1894), pp. 143, 144. The old map-makers fairly reveled in the opportunities thus offered. On the map of Tartary in Blau's *Nieuwe Atlas* of 1635, where the 1570 Ortelius has merely "solitudines vastae," stands the legend: "In deserto Lop et Belgian homines miris illusionibus et diabolico screatu seduci creduntur" ("where men are thought to be seduced by wonderfull illusions and diuinitish spittings," as John Speed has it on his map of China of 1626 in the *Prospect of the Most Famous Parts of the World* [1631?]). And, indeed, on Blau's map twelve devils of the most varied mediæval types are in the act of seducing three faintly outlined and manifestly vanishing mortals. (See also the very Düreresque Lop demon pictured on p. 1098 of Sebastian Munster, ed. 1646.) But even John Speed had moments when his faith was dry. For on his map of Tartary in the larger 1631 edition, in a region we shall have to consider later, near the head of the river Ob, appears the legend: "Pliny placeth the Perosites here whom hee saith to bee so narrow mouthed that they live only by the Smel of rost meat beleue it not." Few of the old cartographers, whose maps are so often the repository of the illustrated fiction of their day, take one more engagingly into their confidence than this same John Speed, "Mercatorum Scissorum frater, Terrarum nostrarum . . . elegantissimus delinctor."

⁴ Of some of these details one may repeat Mr. Brae's remark in the case of the designation "dry"—that the same might be said of any desert. But although certain of the legends are not peculiar to the Gobi (see Yule-Cordier, I, 202), that unquestionably seems to be their most favored haunt, and it is their appearance *together* there which, with what follows, constitutes the force of the argument.

⁵ Cf., for instance, the "elevationes et depressiones" of Mandeville, quoted on p. 12, n. 4.

he never finds his party. And in this way many have perished. . . . And sometimes you shall hear the sound of a variety of musical instruments, and still more commonly the sound of drums. Hence in making this journey 'tis customary for travellers to keep close together.¹

And so, in the records of both East and West, the Desert of Gobi is characterized in the terms of the Sandy Sea.²

What seems to have happened, then, is simply what, *mutatis mutandis*, has happened a hundred times. Starting from some hint in actual fact, a name, a story has its *Wanderjahre* in the realms of myth, fabulous lands of Arthur, or Ogier, or Prester John, and then comes back to reattach itself somehow to fact again. The phantom of Prester John himself could not stay hovering over Asia in his shadowy land of Pentexoire. Before Chaucer's time Rubruquis had identified him, it seems, with Kushluk;³ Marco Polo speaks of Unc (Awang) Khan as a "great prince . . . the same that we call Prester John";⁴ the famous Ghengis Khan was his son David.⁵ Colonel Yule, offering analogy for this very demand for a real Prester John, once wrote:

Precolumbian maps of the Atlantic showed an island of Brazil, an Island of Antillia founded—who knows on what?—whether on the real adventure of a vessel driven in sight of the Azores or the Bermudas, or on mere fancy and fogbank. But when discovery really came to be undertaken, men looked for such lands and found them accordingly. And there they are in our geographies, Brazil and the Antilles.⁶

¹ Ed. Yule-Cordier, I, 197. The other curious sounds, too, of music and drums reappear in Chinese legends of this desert. Sha-chou itself means "sand city" or "sand district" in Chinese (Bretschneider, *op. cit.*, II, 18; Yule-Cordier, I, 206, 193), and "according to the Geography of the Yüan dynasty . . . the name is derived from the *Ming sha shan*, the rumbling sand hill near that place" (Bretschneider, *op. cit.*, II, 216); while a tenth-century Chinese narrative localizes the phenomenon on the eastern border of the Lop desert, under the name of the "Singing Sands." Cf. the striking account in Odoric of "the sundry kinds of music, but chiefly nakers" which he heard in the terrible valley by the River of Delight (Yule, *Cathay*, I, 156-58, ccxlv; *Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Yule-Cordier, I, 202; Bretschneider, *op. cit.*, II, 216).

² Moreover, the readiness with which the *Sandy Sea* might pass into the *Dry Sea*, already exemplified in the lines from the *Titarel*, finds abundant illustration in the present nomenclature of this very region. The *Kum-daria*, or *Sand River*, as one approaches the desert from the west, is also known as the *Kurruk-daria*, or *Dry River* (Hedin, *Central Asia and Thibet*, I, 344). The range of mountains across the desert, roughly parallel with Marco Polo's route, is the *Kurruk-tagh*, the *Dry Mountains* (*ibid.*, 340 and map at end), while the same region is also known as the *Kum-tagh*, the *Sand Mountains* (Hedin, *Reisen in Zentralasien* (1900), index and Map III). There is near Korla a little *Kurruk-köll* or *Dry Lake* (too small to be noted on the map, *ibid.*, p. 71), while close to the Lop-nor is found a *Kum-köll*, or *Sand Lake* (*Central Asia and Thibet*, I, 306; cf. *Reisen*, p. 12).

³ Z. II, 91; *Encycl. Brit.*, XIX, 717.

⁴ *Travels*, ed. Yule-Cordier, I, 228.

⁵ Z. II, 5-59.

⁶ *Travels of Marco Polo*, 2d edition, II, 543.

Precisely so in the fourteenth century the travelers toward the East seem to have looked for the Sandy Sea of Prester John—originally lying who knows where?—and they found it in the terrible Desert of Lop.

That this Sandy Sea of Prester John, with a difference, was Chaucer's Dry Sea, then, as it had certainly been the "trucken mer" of the *Titirel*, there seems excellent reason to believe. It lay at the outposts of Chaucer's scheme of things, in the heart of that vague mediæval India which was to him, as to his times, the eastern limit of the world, and to "go hoodles to the drye see" is, in one aspect, only a more definite phrasing of a well-known commonplace. Death in the *Pardoner's Tale* declares he cannot find a man "though that [he] walked *in-to Inde*."¹ The Wife of Bath was as kind to her fifth husband "as any wyf from Denmark *un-to Inde*."² A sweeter place than the garden of the Rose one could not find, "although he soughte oon *in-til Inde*."³ To the love of the Duchess Blanche herself "no ner nas he That woned at home, than he *in Inde*."⁴ And, curiously enough, the River of Precious Stones that flowed into the Sea of Sand actually appears in an earlier French poem as a similar *terminus ad quem*. For in *Li Diz de l'Erberie* of Rutebeuf we read:

Meir ai passée,
Si m'en reving par la Morée,
Où j'ai fait mout grant demorée,
Et par Salerne,
Par Burienne et par Byterne.
En Puille, en Calabre, Palerne
Ai herbes prises
Jusqu'à la rivière qui bruit
Dou flun des pierres jor et nuit
Fui pierres querre.
Prestres Jehans i a fait guerre:
Je n'osai entrer en la terre,
*Je fui au port.*⁵

¹ C. 722.² D. 824; cf. *Troilus*, V, 971: "bitwixen Orcades and Inde."³ R. R. 624.⁴ *Book of the Duchess*, 889. Chaucer's "Saint Thomas of Inde" (D. 1980, E. 1230), too, is second in importance in the country of the *Epistola* only to Prester John himself. See Z. I, 840 ff.; II, 123, 164, 165, 168-70, etc.⁵ *Œuvres de Rutebeuf*, ed. Jubinal (*Bibl. Elzevirienne*), II, 53. So in Jean Sire de Joinville, who wrote between 1304 and 1309 (Z. II, 83), the Sandy Sea, "une grant berrie de sablon, là où il ne croissoit nul bien," is the eastern limit of the world: "Cette berrie com-

But, granted the contention thus far made, can one be sure that Chaucer's Dry Sea was not after all merely the *unlocalized* Sandy Sea of the *Letter* and *Mandeville*? Half-way between fable and fact as the matter now stands, the Carrenar takes it, I think, safely over the border.

IV

One of the things that strike the reader of mediæval travel in the East is the constant recurrence of the word *cara*, meaning "black." John de Plano Carpini (1245-47), for instance, speaks of "terram *nigrorum* Kythaorum,"¹ referring to what he had before called "terra . . . Karakyaorum."² More definitely William de Rubruquis (1253-55), speaking of Con Can, remarks: "Iste Con erat Cara-Catay. *Cara* idem est quod *nigrum*. Catai nomen gentis. Unde Cara-Catay idem est quod nigri Catay."³ Referring to the famous Tartar drink, he says: "Faciunt etiam *Cara-cosmos*, hoc est *nigrum* cosmos."⁴ So Roger Bacon⁵ speaks of "*Catayam nigram*: unde vocatur *Cara* Cataia"; and the list might be prolonged *ad libitum*. Untranslated, the word occurs in both Plano Carpini and Rubruquis in the name of the great Tartar capital *Caracorum*,⁶ which also appears in Marco Polo.⁷ In the latter writer it is found as well in the names *Carajan*,⁸ "in which the first element was the Mongol or Turki *Kârd*, 'Black,'" and *Caramoran*, the "Black River."¹⁰ Other examples might be

mençoit a unes très-grans roches merveilleuses, qui sont en la fin dou monde devers Orient, lesquies roches nulz hons ne passa onques, si comme li Tartarin le tesmoignent; et disoient que léans estoit enclous li peuples Got et Margoth," etc. But even more interesting, for its bearing on the problem of the Carrenar now to be considered, is the fact that Joinville's account brought to Europe an Asiatic word, which remained unexplained until a few years ago. For, as Colonel Yule has pointed out, the expression "berrie de sablon," not before elucidated, "is the Arabic . . . *Bâriya*, 'a Desert.' No doubt Joinville learned the word in Palestine" (*Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Yule-Cordier, I, 237, note).

¹ *The Texts and Versions of John de Plano Carpini and William de Rubruquis* (Hakluyt Soc., 1903), p. 98. Both texts are also given in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* (ed. Hakluyt Soc., 1903), Vol. I; in *Purchas his Pilgrims* (1625), Vol. III; in the *Recueil des voyages*, Vol. IV; etc.

² *Ibid.*, p. 81. On the name *Kara Khitai* see Bretschneider, *Mediæval Researches*, I, 210.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 151.

⁵ *Purchas his Pilgrims*, III, 56.

⁶ *Carpini and Rubruquis* (Hakluyt Soc.), pp. 75 (*Cracurim*), 168, 180, 182 (*Caracorum*). The word is made up of "Mongol, *Kara*, 'black,' and *Kuren*, 'a camp'" (*Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Yule-Cordier (1903), I, 227, note).

⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 228, 269; II, 460 (as *Caracoron*).

⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 64.

⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 72, 73, note.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 22, 23, 142, 143. It is the modern Hwang-ho, or Yellow River, of the Chinese. Cf. Odoric, in Yule's *Cathay and the Way Thither* (Hakluyt Soc.), I, 125.

cited; but the list as given is sufficient to make clear the presence in Europe before the fourteenth century of Asiatic proper names containing the Mongol or Turkish element *kara*, "black," of whose meaning there was also more or less recognition.¹

But there is another word which with almost equal frequency occurs in place-names throughout the same regions.² In Marco Polo's chapter just preceding his account of Chandu—the Xanadu of Coleridge's poem—is a reference to another "stately pleasure-dome" of the Grand Khan, at "a city called *Chagan Nor*, which is as much as to say White Pool."³ Examples of this Mongol word *nor* (*nur*, *aur*), which forms the final element in the name just mentioned, and means "Great Lake,"⁴ may be seen by the score on central Asian maps,⁵ and its use is as old as the Mongol era itself. But the last syllable of Chaucer's word as he must have written it was, as we have seen, not *-nare*, but *-nar*. His *Carrenar*, accordingly, is a manifest equivalent of *Kara-nor*, or "Black Lake," taken bodily over into English with no change whatever, save a slight modification of the vowel of its final syllable. This variation is entirely insignificant, yet, trifling as it

¹The records, however, give no least idea of the diffusion of the word in proper names throughout the Mongol domains. Anyone who has examined maps, ancient or modern, of central Asia knows them to be as full of names in *Kara* "as ben on treës rokes nestes." In the index to Sven Hedin's *Reisen in Zentralasien* (*Petermann's Mitteilungen, Ergänzungsheft* No. 131, 1900), p. 358, are eighty-eight proper names in *Kara*, such as *Kara-bag*, *Kara-basch*, *Kara-buran*, *Kara-dasch*, *Kara-kir*, *Kara-köll*, *Kara-saj*, *Kara-sar*, *Kara-tam*, etc. A glance at the third map, for example, in the same volume, that of the Lop-nor region, will give a notion of their distribution. Those who wish further information regarding the word, especially in composition, may consult Redhouse, *Turkish Dictionary* (1856), p. 884; Bianchi, *Dictionnaire Turc-Français* (1837), II, 468; Vámbéry, *Uigurische Sprachmonumente* (1870), p. 221; *Cagataische Sprachstudien* (1867), p. 309; Amyot, *Dictionnaire Tartare-Mantchou Français* (1789), I, 345, 346; Xylander, *Das Sprachgeschlecht der Titanen* (1837), pp. 107, 285, 344; Knox, *Glossary of Geographical and Topographical Terms*, London, 1904.

²At this point I am indebted to Professor Leo Wiener for the clue to what follows. After reaching the conclusion that the Mongol *kara* had clearly some connection with the *Carrenar*, I ventured to ask Professor Wiener, without any hint of the connection, what *Kara-nar* would mean in any dialect with which he was familiar. The instant answer was: "Black Lake!" After that, it simply remained to search for a body of water so named.

³Yule-Cordier, I, 296; cf. 297, note 3; 214, note; 304, note 1.

⁴*Ibid.*, I, 200; Xylander, *op. cit.*, pp. 242, 286; Hedin, *Central Asia and Thibet* (1903), II, 139; Knox, *op. cit.*, s. v. "Nor."

⁵In the western half alone of the map of Chinese Tartary (No. 18) in D'Anville's *Nouvel atlas de la Chine, de la Tartarie chinoise, et du Thibet* (1737), the word *-nor* (given in the *Explication* as the equivalent of "lac ou étang") occurs no less than forty-five times, in such combinations as *Koko Nor*, *Alac Nor*, *Kirkir Nor*, *Courgue Nor*, *Taal Nor*, *Toson Nor*, etc. On Hedin's fifth map in the *Reisen* (that of the Kuku-nor region) one finds twenty-three *nor*'s—*Kurtik-nor*, *Bucha-nor*, *Tsaring-nor*, *Tzaka-nor*, *Konga-nor*, etc.

is, it finds complete analogy in Chaucer's *Marrok* for *Morocco*,¹ and in his *Alkaron* for *Alkoran*.² The question at once arises, then: Is there, or was there, such a lake?

There was and is, and it lay, as we shall see, not only at a veritable strategic point for passage into Europe, but actually on the very border of the Dry Sea itself! For on the eastern edge of the great desert of Lop, about 155 miles northeast from the famous *Lop-nor*³ and about half that distance slightly northwest of Marco Polo's *Sachiu*, fed by the river Boulonghir, whose basin forms a natural highway,⁴ is a lake of about 22 miles (80 *li*) from east to west, and 8 miles (30 *li*) from north to south,⁵ still called the *Kara-nor*. It appears on numerous and ancient Chinese maps⁶ and on the earliest European maps of China,⁷ and may be followed from them to the most recent surveys of the region.⁸ But it is its relations in Chaucer's time with which we are concerned, and of those the last five years have made it possible to speak with practical assurance. Its position on the edge of what we have seen

¹ E. 465.

² B. 332.

³ Dutreuil de Rhins, *L'Asie centrale: Thibet et régions limitrophes* (Paris, 1889), p. 150.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 125 ff.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 150 note; Sven Hedin, *Reisen* (1900), p. 145 note, quoting from the *Si-yü-shuei-tao-ki*.

⁶ E. g., the excellent map from the *K'in-ting Sin-kiang tche-liô* (1821) at the end of Imbault-Huart's *Le pays de 'Hami ou Khamil* (Paris, 1892); cf. p. 4.

⁷ In the *Novus Atlas Sinensis* of Martini (1654) — "qu'on doit considérer . . . comme les premières véritables cartes européennes de la Chine" (Dutreuil de Rhins, *op. cit.*, p. 29) — the map of China is "représentée d'après les cartes de la Géographie chinoise de la dynastie des Ming, dont la première édition fut publiée en Chine en 1394" (*ibid.*). In the Blau edition of 1656, which I have consulted, on the map of the Provincia Xansi (before p. 45) a *Mare nigrum* (*Sinis Cinghai*) lies at the edge of the "Xamo desertum, Europæis Lop dicitur," to the south of Xacheu; cf. also p. 54, text. This may perhaps be the lake in the Kuku-nor district mentioned later; but on the *Carte générale de la Tartarie chinoise* (No. 18) in D'Anville's *Nouvel atlas de la Chine, de la Tartarie chinoise et du Thibet*, La Haye 1737 ("cartes dressées d'après les travaux des Jésuites pour la Chine, et d'après ceux des Lamas pour le Thibet," Dutreuil de Rhins, *op. cit.*, p. 30), the Hara Nor (*sic*) lies a little northwest of Tchatcheou; see also the *Carte générale du Thibet* (No. 32). The lake itself, however, though unnamed, is clearly marked as early as 1581 on the astonishingly accurate map of *Tertia pars Asiae* of that year (reproduced as Plate LVI of Nordenskiöld's *Periplus*) by Jacopo Gastaldi. It is there an unnamed *stagno*, northwest of *Sachiu*, into which a river in the position of the Boulonghir flows (another small one running south), at the edge of the *Diserto de Lop*, where is also inscribed the legend of the devils. On this map of Gastaldi, see Cordier in Yule's *Travels of Marco Polo*, I, 187. The *Deserto Lop* is distinctly marked on the map of Fra Mauro of 1459; the *civitas Lop* (or *Sop*) on the Borgia map of early in the same century; and *Lop* on the map of Leardus, of 1443 (see Santarem, *op. cit.*, III, 275, 417 and *Atlas*). The eighteenth-century maps after D'Anville on which the *Kara-nor* appears by name are too numerous to mention.

⁸ See especially, of the large and excellent maps which supplement Dutreuil de Rhins's above-mentioned volume, Feuille 2, (on which the lake will be found about long. 91°, lat.

to be the Sandy Sea would be sufficient in itself to establish a strong presumption in favor of its identity as the Carrenar, but there is still more to be said. Marco Polo, as we know, passed from Cotan¹ to Pein,² thence to Charcan, and, after five days' journey, to the city of Lop, at the entrance of the great desert.³ His thirty days' passage across the desert has already been considered; at the end of the thirty days, however, he reached the city of Sachi, lying between northeast and east, in a province called Tangut.⁴ Volumes have been written about his route, but, strangely enough, discoveries made in central Asia within the last nine years—some within the past four years—have not only rendered it extremely probable that he passed directly by the Kara-nor, but (what is more important) have put beyond all doubt the fact that the lake lay on what now seems almost certainly the long-lost Kan Suh imperial highway, one of the great early mediæval arteries of commerce between the Orient and the West. Chinese maps have long marked such a route. In the great Chinese atlas of Tai thsing,⁵ for instance, which sums up the Chinese knowledge of many centuries, the northern route from Sa tchou traverses the valley of the Boulonghir, and follows the river straight to the Kara-nor.⁶ The same great highway may be

40° 30'), and Feuille 4, Carte No. 8. The latter gives the relations of the Kara-nor to Lop-nor, Sa tchou and the various itineraries; cf. text, pp. 125, 126, 138, 146, 150. See also Sven Hedin's *Reisen* (1900), pp. 127, 144-46, 154, 157 ff., 159 note. It may be readily located in such atlases as those of Black (Edinburgh, 1879), Map 28; Bartholomew (London, 1890), Map 51; Stieler (*Hand-Atlas*, 1901-4), Map No. 62; etc. See also the maps in Forster, *History of Voyages and Discoveries in the North* (London, 1786), cf. p. 132; Sven Hedin, *Through Asia* (1898), Vol. II, end; *Central Asia and Thibet* (1903), Vol. I, end; Prejevalsky, *From Kulja to Lob-nor* (1879); *Reisen in Thibet*, (1884); etc.

Another Kara-nor may be seen, to the south of the one just mentioned, on the maps of Dutreuil de Rhins, about long. 90°, lat. 32°, off the route to Lhassa. Both are found on Feuille 2; the second alone on Feuille 7, Carte No. 14, Feuille 8, Carte No. 15, and Feuille 10, Carte No. 19; cf. text, pp. 391, 393. It appears on Tafel V of Hedin's *Reisen* (1900) about long. 99°, lat. 35°; cf. p. 328. It may also be seen (about long. 90°, lat. 33°) in Black's *Atlas*, Map 28. On D'Anville's map of Thibet it lies almost due west of Koko-nur. See Prejevalsky's *Mongolia* (1876), II, 166. Certain maps give what is apparently a third Kara-nor farther north. The one in the text, however, seems to be the only one lying on a great east-and-west trade-route.

¹ Ed. Yule-Cordier, I, 188; see Stein, *op. cit.*, index, s. v. "Pi-mo."

² Ed. Yule-Cordier, I, 191, and cf. 192, 193.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 194, 195.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 203 ff.

⁵ *Tai Thsing y tong yu Tou*, eds. 1744, 1756, 1761, 1862; see Dutreuil de Rhins, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 146, cf. pp. 140-47; cf. also *Supplement*, Feuille 4, Carte No. 8. See the same highway marked on Feuille 2, and its continuation to Khotan on Feuille 1.

be seen on the *Carte générale du Thibet* in D'Anville, passing directly by the Kara-nor.¹

It was, however, the discoveries referred to as made between 1896 and 1901 that settled beyond doubt the actual existence of this ancient route. In the former year Dr. Sven Hedin found, bearing southeast from Korla toward the Lop-nor, a long string of mileposts, lofty pyramids of wood and clay, measuring the distance of the road in Chinese *li*.² It clearly marked an old and important highway, but whither was not then clear. In 1900 Hedin returned to the same region and found more *toras*, or "road pyramids," marking, as was now evident, "the ancient highway called by the inhabitants of Lop *Kömur-salldi-yoll*, i. e., 'the road where coal was spread,' which ran from Sachow to Korla"—following, indeed, the course preserved in still extant Lop traditions as that of the great highway to Pekin.³ The towers appeared again at the lake-basin of the old Lop-nor,⁴ where Hedin discovered ruins, to which he returned in 1901. The results of his investigations were startling, for among other things over two hundred strips of paper and forty-two wooden tablets, all covered with writing, were excavated.⁵ These documents, still being deciphered, go back as far as the years 264–70 A. D.,⁶ and locate definitely the lost region of Loñ-lan, which, situated "between the great northern highway and the great southern highway from China to Europe," had played a very important part in early Chinese history.⁷ But the discoveries (and here they touch our problem) also invested, as Hedin points out, "with a totally different meaning the ancient highway" referred to, and "tell us, for instance, that there was a regular postal service between Lop-nor and Sa-chow, and thus that there existed an established means of communication through the desert of Gobi."⁸

¹ The highroad is also marked on the *Carte de l'empire de Hya et partie de Tangut* of N. Bellini, 1749, passing Lac Kara. Strangely enough, on the map of Fra Mauro (1459) a broad *strada de mango* passes east of the *Deserto Lop*.

² *Through Asia* (London, 1898), II, 864. See map at end of volume.

³ Hedin, *Central Asia and Thibet* (London and New York, 1903), I, 338, 344.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 378.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 134–36.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 132.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 139 ff.; cf. 136.

⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 136.

But that is not all. For this highway passes straight by the Kara-nor. That knowledge we owe the French traveler Bonin, who, in 1889, working from the other end, had started from "la célèbre oasis de Sha-tcheou, le Sai-tou de Marco Polo, appelé aujourd'hui officiellement Toung-hoang-hsien," and had gone northwest to the Kara-nor.¹ To his great delight he too discovered an ancient and abandoned highway, marked by clay towers about thirty feet high every five *lis*, "exactement comme la grande route impériale du Kan-sou dont elle semble le prolongement."² The towers had once been connected by a wall, and other fortifications were found near by. "There is no doubt," M. Bonin writes,³ "that all these remains are those of the great route, vainly sought after till now, which, under the Han Dynasty, ran to China through Bactria, Pamir, Eastern Turkestan, the Desert of Gobi, and Kan Suh: it is in part the route followed by Marco Polo when he went from Charchan to Shachau, by the City of Lob." Hedin's and Bonin's roads seem clearly one and the same, and as a result of their investigations M. Cordier, who did not know the further confirmation offered by Sven Hedin's latest Loñ-lan discoveries, gives Marco Polo's route as passing directly by the Kara-nor, which he marks, without naming it, on the itinerary.⁴ The Kara-nor, accordingly, as we now know, lay on one of the oldest and most important of the great trade routes between Europe and central Asia, the route over which not only Marco Polo, but doubtless scores of other Europeans, passed; and that its name, like a hundred Oriental tales, should travel by word of mouth to Europe is inherently probable enough.⁵

For one is apt to overlook the fact that what after 1368 (when the Mongol dynasty in China was dethroned and the country barred to foreigners)⁶ was literally "forgete in solitarie wilderness," so that, as Colonel Yule points out, "all those regions,

¹ *La géographie (Bulletin de la société de géographie)*, 15 March, 1901, p. 171.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 172, 173.

³ I quote Cordier's translation, *Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Yule-Cordier, I, 203.

⁴ No. IV, at the end of Vol. I; see also p. 199, near foot.

⁵ It is seen to be the more probable when one recalls that the Kara-nor would be the last body of water before the desert to those traveling west, the first after the desert to those going east—a fact which would impress it vividly upon the traveler's mind.

⁶ Nordenskiöld, *Periplus*, p. 140.

when reopened only two centuries later, seemed almost as absolutely new discoveries as the empires which about the same time Cortes and Pizarro were annexing in the West"¹—one forgets that all this, in more or less confused outlines, was common knowledge in the first half of the fourteenth century. Before Chaucer wrote, not only the Polos, but John of Plano Carpini, William de Rubruquis, Hayton of Armenia, John of Monte Corvino, Andrew of Perugia, John de Cora, Friar Odoric of Pordenone, John Marignolli, and the Moor Ibn Batuta are known to have visited eastern Asia and Cathay.² The road to Cathay was so frequently traveled by merchants at the beginning of the fourteenth century that Francesco Balducci Pegolotti, a factor of the commercial house of the Bardi in Florence, wrote a guide for travelers in the Far East under the title *Libro di divisamenti di Paesi*.³ Mongol emissaries were sent west, as Carpini and Rubruquis were sent east.⁴ Ancient European seals were dug up by Stein in 1901 in the ruins near Khotan, likewise on the great commercial routes, halfway between Europe and Pekin.⁵ Oriental stories that long before Chaucer's time had reached southern Europe are irrefutable

¹ *Cathay*, I, cxxxiii; note especially the evidence cited on pp. cxxxiii-iv.

² For the documents, see the collection in Yule's *Cathay and the Way Thither* (Hakluyt Soc.), 1866, Vols. I, II. Cf. Nordenskiöld, *Periplus*, pp. 137-40; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXIV, 488-92.

³ Nordenskiöld, *loc. cit.*; see extracts from the book in Yule's *Cathay*, II, 279-308, and cf. especially p. 283. Particularly should the incidental testimony of Jacques de Vitry be noted: "Et taliter errant omnes, qui sunt in terra presbyteri Iohannis, sicut mihi dixit quidam mercator, cum nuper inde venerat (1217, letter to Ludgardis, see Z. II, 5, 6). So, writing of the supposed King David, the son of Prestor John, he says: "Mercatores etiam a partibus Orientis species aromaticas et lapides pretiosos deferentes, consimiles litteras attulerunt. Quotquot autem de partibus illis veniunt, idem dicunt" (Z. II, 14). Still more important is it to recall how the "sowdan of Surrye," when the merchants "came from any strange place" would

... bisilly espye
Tydings of sundry regnes, for to lere
The wondres that they mighte seen or here (B. 176-82).

Nor should one forget the

... shipmen and pilgrymes,
With scrippes bret-ful of lesinges,
Entremedled with tydinges,

whom Chaucer saw in the "house of twigges" (*H. F.*, 2122-24).

⁴ Beazley, *The Dawn of Modern Geography* (1901), II, 15. Cf. the "embassy of the Nestorian monk, Rabban Cauma, an Uigur, born at Pekin, who visits (c. 1282) Rome, Paris, and Bordeaux, which he calls the capital of England." See Bretschneider, *op. cit.*, especially I. 4-8.

⁵ See the extremely interesting accounts in his *Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan* (1903), especially pp. 397, xvii-xviii.

evidence of long-forgotten channels of oral communication between East and West—stories that sometimes brought Eastern names along with them, like that of Rasalu (the Rosselho of the *Lives of the Troubadours*).¹ Western names (the Wallachia of Chaucer's poem itself, for instance)² were known in the Far East. The silence of the maps offers no difficulty, for it was, as Norden-skiöld points out, precisely the unlearned public who accepted descriptions like Marco Polo's as revelations from a new world, while these same descriptions exercised no real influence on cartography until they had found confirmation from the Portuguese voyages, to which, indeed, they had contributed the main impetus.³ There is, then, the strongest antecedent probability that Chaucer could have known the region with which we are concerned—a probability which the relation of the Sandy Sea to the Desert of Gobi, the verbal identity of his Carrenar with the Kara-nor, and the actual, unmistakable juxtaposition of the two seem to bring as near certainty as can well be expected when "by assay ther may no man hit preve." That the Carrenar was the Kara-nor, accordingly, we may without much further hesitation conclude. That the Dry Sea was the Desert of Gobi seems equally difficult to doubt, so that Chaucer's lines constitute a curious and suggestive symbol of the transition from the mediæval to the modern world—from the age of Mandeville (far cry as it may seem) to the age of Sven Hedin. There are, however, certain clearly defined facts which, unexpectedly enough, seem to point to the possibility of an additional and most interesting association of ideas, and which bring, perhaps, the Dry Sea of fable into relation with fact on still another side.

V

What follows should be considered by itself, independently of what precedes; for while, if its inferences prove sound, it is intimately connected with what has gone before, it must none the

¹ Patzig, *Zur Geschichte der Herzmäre*, Berlin, 1891, p. 10.

² *Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Yule-Cordier, II, 489; cf. 479 ff., and Bretschneider, *op. cit.*, II, 73-84, 324, 329, for European names in Chinese records.

³ Nordenskiöld, *Periplus*, p. 140; see especially *Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Yule-Cordier, I, 123-37.

less—be it distinctly said—stand or fall irrespective of that, on its own evidence. The fact referred to is that almost exactly two hundred years after Chaucer wrote, a Dry Sea actually so called in records and on maps was known in England. The question is: Could it have been known as well in Chaucer's time?

In 1611 Sir Thomas Smith, governor of the Russia Company, sent Josias Logan and others along the north coast of Russia to the mouth of the Petchora River, to establish a trade with England. In *Purchas his Pilgrims*, in the account of Logan's voyage written by William Gourdon, the pilot of the expedition, occur the following words:

The same day, leaving our ship lying so, . . . being rowed in our Skiffe by six of our Mariners, [we] tooke our way toward the Towne over a shoald Sea, which the *Russes* cal *The Dry Sea*: which may very wel be so called. For on the starboord or West side going up is a low dry Sand, and on the Larboord or East side is all shoald water, as two, three or foure foote water. And seven leagues within to the South-west is an lland, called *Dolgoi* . . . which you must keep on the Larboord . . . and then steer away South South-west, neere upon twentie leagues, all in shoald water . . . The twelfth, we passed over the *Drie Sea* (which the *Russes* call in their Language, *Suchoi Morie*) to the mouth of the River *Pechora*.¹

In the other records of the same expedition, and of one three years later, at least six additional references to the Dry Sea occur.² It is clear, then, that the early seventeenth-century traders knew at the mouth of the Petchora a body of water already called the Dry Sea. The name, it is distinctly stated, is one they found, not one they gave.

But we have the testimony of maps as well as of records. On a map drawn by Isaac Massa, and published in 1612 by Hessel Gerard,³ which according to the statement of the publisher is a copy of a Russian chart,⁴ the *Soechaia more* is placed at the mouth

¹ Vol. III, 532.

² See, in accounts of the same expedition, mention of "the *Sookhie Mora* or *Drie Sea*" (*Purchas*, III, 538, 539, twice); "the *Dry Sea*" (III, 545); "the *Suchoi-morie*, that is, *The Drie* or *shoald Sea*" (III, 550). Three years later, William Gourdon twice mentions the "*Drie Sea*" (III, 554). Cf. Hamel, *Tradescant der Aeltere* (St. Petersburg, 1847), pp. 216, 227; *England and Russia*, pp. 312, 336.

³ A facsimile is given in *Barents's Three Voyages to the Arctic Regions* (Hakluyt Soc. 1876) opposite p. lxxxvii, and also in Nordenskiöld's *Voyage of the Vega*, I, opposite p. 239.

⁴ Nordenskiöld, *op. cit.*, p. 239; Hamel, *Tradescant*, p. 217, n. 2; *England and Russia*, p. 316. For further bibliography of the map see *Barents's Three Voyages*, pp. lxxxvii-viii.

of the Petchora River, precisely as the English navigators had described it, while in the explanation of Russian names attached, *Soechoiamore* is defined as "Droogezee." As *Suchomoro* it appears on Massa's large map of Russia of 1614,¹ and for more than a century may be traced on the maps of Hondius,² Blauue,³ Piscatore,⁴ Guillaume de l'Isle,⁵ Olearius,⁶ the *Atlas maritimus novus*,⁷ Sanson,⁸ and others.⁹

We may, however, carry it back still earlier. On his 1568 chart of the Northern Ocean, William Burroughs¹⁰ marks clearly the *Sugha mora*, but not at the mouth of the Petchora. On this chart, preserved in the British Museum,¹¹ and bearing Burroughs's own signature, the Dry Sea is placed at the head of the White Sea, slightly north of the east mouth of the Dvina.¹² Nor is one's first impression that Burroughs, despite his claim of accuracy, has put the Dry Sea at the mouth of the wrong river, justified.

¹ See Blauue, *Nieuwe Atlas* (1635), where the map (Vol. I, No. 6) is said to be "dedicata ab Hesselto Gerardo, M. DC. XIII." So again the map of Russia after Massa in the Blauue *Atlas* of 1646-49 (Vol. I, No. 15) puts the *Soechia more* at the mouth of the Petchora.

² As *Soechia more* on the map of 1633 in V. Kordt, *Materialy po istorii russkoi kartografii* (1899), Plate XXIX; cf. pp. 13-15.

³ See n. 2.

⁴ As *sucho more*, on the map of 1651 (Plate XXXI in Kordt).

⁵ As *Souchoe More* in the Amsterdam editions of Covens and Mortier, and of R. and I. Ottens.

⁶ As *Suchomero* in the *Voyages and Travels of the Ambassadors* (trans. Davies, London, 1662), opposite p. 60; as *Souchoe More* in the superb edition of Wicquefort (Amsterdam, 1727), after p. 155.

⁷ London, 1702, (Chart IV) as *Soecheaia More*. ⁸ Ed. 169-(7), Map 35, as *Soecheaia More*.

⁹ The list given is rather representative than exhaustive.

¹⁰ William Burroughs, "pilot major" of the ill-fated expedition under Sir Hugh Willoughby in 1553, escaping the disaster that befell his chief and sailing "so farre, that hee came at last to the place where hee found no night at all, but a continuall light and brightness of the Sunne shining clearely upon the huge and mightie Sea" (*Principal Navigations*, ed. Hakluyt Soc., 1903, II, 248), finally entered the White Sea. From the dedicatory epistle to Queen Elizabeth "annexed unto his exact and notable mappe of Russia" (*ibid.*, III, 209), presented to the Queen in 1578, but now lost (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*, V, 405), we learn that he returned to the Bay of St. Nicholas and the surrounding regions in 1557 and from that time yearly, "setting downe alwayes with great care and diligence, true observations and notes of all those countreys, Islands [and] coasts of the sea," so that he found himself "sufficiently furnished to give report . . . and to make description of those North parts of the world in forme and maner of every league's distance that I have passed and seene in all those my travels." His explicit and undisputed claim to minute and first-hand knowledge of the region in question should be read in full.

¹¹ O. R. MS 18 D. iii, 123; See *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, loc. cit.

¹² A facsimile of the chart is given in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* (ed. Hakluyt Soc., 1903), Vol. III, opposite p. 224. A smaller facsimile is given in *Early Voyages and Travels to Russia and Persia* (Hakluyt Soc., 1886), Vol. II, opposite p. 254; see also I, cxxv.

For there is abundant independent evidence that he was correct. On Isaac Massa's map of 1612, already mentioned as the copy of a Russian original, at the mouth of the Dvina, (to the west, however, of Burroughs's location of it) is a corresponding bay designated *Sechomo*, which, as Hamel points out,¹ "soll *Sukhoe More* heissen." On other maps, however, this *Sechomou* is found precisely where Burroughs puts his *Sugha mora*, at the east mouth of the Dvina.² And all these maps,³ it should be noted, have also the *Suchaia More* at the mouth of the Petchora. That is to say, there is direct and explicit evidence that the great shoals at the mouths of both rivers were called in Russian the Dry Sea;⁴ and the point thus far established is that soon after the middle of the sixteenth century the name had reached England, associated with the region of the Petchora and the Dvina.⁵ Could the same

¹ *Tradescant der Aeltere*, p. 236.

² That is the case, for instance, on the maps of Guillaume de l'Isle (eds. Soutter and Vindel, Covens and Mortier, and Ottens), and of the 1727 Olearius (see p. 28, n. 6).

³ Except the Soutter and Vindel edition of de l'Isle, which does not include the mouth of the Petchora.

⁴ There seems to be a very particular reason why the name *Sugha More* should attach to some part of the mouths of the Dvina. Paulus Jovius (and it must be remembered that his account of Muscovia derives directly from the Russian Dmitry Gerassimow [Demetrius Erasmus]; see *P. Jovii Libellus*, A. iii; Michow, *Die Altensten Karten von Russland*, Hamburg, 1884, pp. 21, 22; Adelung, *Die Reisenden in Russland bis 1700*, 1846, I, pp. 187-91; Hamel, *England and Russia*, London, 1854, pp. 46 ff.) wrote in 1525 of the Dvina: "This increasyng at certayne tymes of the yeere, as dooth the ryuer Nilus, ouerfloweth the feeldes and playnes . . . When it riseth by reason of molten snow, and great showres of rayne, it falleth into the Ocean by unknown nations, and with so large a trenche, lyke unto a great sea, that it can not be sayled ouer in one day with a prosperous wynde. But when the waters are fallen, they leaue here and there large and fruitfull Ilandes: For come there cast on the ground, groweth without anye helpe of the Plowe, and with meruaylous celeritie of hasteng nature, fearyng the newe iniurie of the proude ryuer, doth both spryng and rype in short space." Quoted from Richard Eden's "Of the North-East Frostie Seas," in *Notes upon Russia* (Hakluyt Soc., 1852), II, 240; see also the *First Three English Books on America* (ed. Arber, 1885), p. 312. For the Latin text see Huttich, *Novus orbis* (1537) p. 538; Starczewski *Historiae Ruthenicae Scriptores exteri Saeculi XVI*. (1841) Part II, 7: etc. Curiously enough, the account strikingly parallels that of the Lake of Caireknitz, so that practically everything claimed for that by Brae accrues to the *Sugha More* itself.

⁵ It so happens that the original nucleus of the Ashmolean Museum came to England from the country of the Dry Sea. For the famous collection which, to quote the Tradescant epitaph,

"As Homer's Iliad in a nut
A world of wonders in a closet shut,"

was brought back by the botanist John Tradescant from the mouth of the Dwina in 1618. The quaint account of his travels—his delight in the "single Rosses, wondrous sweet," four or five acres together; in the pinks on Rose Island (the English headquarters) "growing naturall of the best sort we have heere in England;" in what a Brabander, always drunk once a day, told him of the "tulipes and narsisus" to be found in the land; in the red, white and black currants, the strawberries and the wild cherries (for the country about the *Suchoi More* was by no means dry)—all this may be found in Hamel's *England and Russia*, pp. 242-98, a translation of his *Tradescant der Aeltere*.

thing have happened two centuries earlier, and either application of the name have reached the England of Chaucer's time?

To the unhesitating negative likely to be one's first reply, there is, I think, strong presumptive evidence to oppose. Two probabilities must be established: first, that the Russian *name* in question could have been actually in use before 1369; secondly, that knowledge of the *region* (which, the first point once established, carries with it, of course, the possibility of acquaintance with the name) could have reached England prior to that year. It will simplify matters to consider the second question first. And it may perhaps be premised that the investigation of the matter seems to have important bearings beyond its relation to the present case.

Strangely enough, knowledge of the very region where Burroughs's chart places the Dry Sea had come to England almost exactly four hundred years before the *Book of the Duchesse* was written. For it was, as is now universally admitted, into the White Sea that Ohthere made the daring voyage which, about the year 890, he reported in person to King Alfred.¹ Whether or not the great river into which he turned was, as the majority of commentators seem to think, the Dvina itself, the sole point which here concerns us is the fact that knowledge of the region *could*, because it *did*, reach England long before Chaucer's time. Nor was Ohthere the only adventurer who came with tidings of just this quarter of the northern seas to the English court. Evidence of many sorts seems to establish the substantial trustworthiness of the stories in the sagas of early voyages to Gandvik—the White Sea of modern maps. I pass over the expeditions of Eric Blood-axe to Bjarmaland and the Dvina about 922;² of Hallvarðr the Esterling³ toward the close of the same century; and of Harald Graycloak about 970,⁴ because none of these afford a direct link with England, though the stream of Scandinavian

¹ See bibliography in Bosworth's *Orosius*, Part II, pp. 39, 40; to which may be added Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 31; Nordenskiöld, *Voyage of the Vega* (1881), I, 46-51; *Periplus*, p. 96; Rabot, *A travers la Russie boréale* (1894), p. 163.

² Laing, *The Sagas of the Norse Kings*, I, 382; *Saga of King Olaf* (ed. Sephton), p. 6; *Egil's Saga*, chap. xxxvii; Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 32, 33.

³ *Burnt Njal's Saga*, chap. xxviii; Beazley, II, 33.

⁴ *Saga of Harald Graycloak*, chap. xiv; *Antiquités russes* (ed. Rafn, 1850), I, 271, 272.

vikings thither must certainly not be forgotten.¹ But every reference in the sagas to their journeys reveals the region as even then a well-known and accepted goal for the more daring spirits of a restless race. About 1020, however, occurred a stirring and dramatic incident which does connect once more Bjarmaland, and that suggestively, with England—the voyage, I mean, of Karli and Gunnsteinn and of Thórir Hundr to the mouth of the Dvina, their visit to the merchant town (specifically so called) to purchase furs, and, after the fair was at an end and their truce had expired, their thrilling robbery of the temple of the god Jómala, and their escape, under pursuit of the enraged Bjarmians, with the rich booty of gold and silver. These very treasures of the temple, however, are incidental confirmation of something already established on other grounds, and something whose importance to this discussion will appear at once—the fact, namely, that what the Northmen found in the White Sea, startling as it may seem, was an active trade connection with the Orient. For during the Middle Ages the region of the Dvina and the Petchora seems to have passed for “un Eldorado septentrional,” to which Arabs, Mongols, Byzantines, and Novgorodians resorted for the precious furs.² Across the portages between the great river courses³ the Bjarmians transported the merchandise received from Arabs or from merchants of Bolghar⁴ to traffic with the Scandinavian adventurers, and through those solitudes there actually opened a route of exportation for the commerce of Asia—a route along which who can tell what fragments of *story* may not have traveled from East and South to Scandinavia, together with the bits of Byzantine pottery and the Arabic and Cufic coins that have been dug up in North Russia?⁵ From the earliest times accordingly, the region

¹ See Nordenskiöld, *Periplus*, p. 84, for their influence on English geographical knowledge.

² Ch. Rabot, *A travers la Russie boréale* (Paris, 1894), pp. 161-64; cf. p. 159: “le bassin de la Petchora a été jadis un des centres commerciaux les plus importants de l’Europe et une des principales voies historiques de la Russie;” cf. Sommer, *Siriéni, Ostiacchi e Samoiedi dell’ Ob* (Firenze, 1837), pp. 40-48; Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 462-64, note.

³ It has been well said that “dans le Nord russe comme au Canada, les portages ont tracé les voies à la colonisation.” Rabot, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

⁴ On Bolghar, or Bulgar, see Bretschneider, *Medieval Researches*, II, 81-84, and index s. v. “Bulgaria, on the Volga.” Cf. Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 462-64.

⁵ For an account of articles dug up evidencing Asiatic trade-routes, see Aspelin, *Antiquités du Nord Finno-Ougrien* (Helsinki, 1877), pp. 123-25, with the following figures, p. 250, etc. Cf. Rabot, *op. cit.*, p. 161, for mention of the superb Byzantine vases unearthed in

of the *Suchoi More* must have been more or less vaguely projected against the dim background of the farther East. Karli's and Thórir's spoils, then, are significant. But just those treasures of the god Jómala, if the sagas are to be trusted, went to England! For Thórir subsequently murdered Karli for his share of the booty, and thereupon escaped to England and betook himself to King Canute, having with him, we are told, "with other things all the money he and Karli had taken in Bjarmaland."¹ Once more, accordingly, and not after the fashion of a thing done in a corner, knowledge of the mysterious region came to England.

This was in the first quarter of the eleventh century. From that time to the second half of the fourteenth century, when Chaucer wrote, opportunities for scraps of information to travel southward—and more than that there is no call to establish—abundant chances that vagrant rumors should drift to England about strange regions "fer in the north countree," may, I think, be accepted without question. For we are brought at once into still closer and more definite relations with the great mediæval trade-routes to the North, and to try for a moment to see into what distant and (to most of us whose study is directed to the literature alone) what unsuspected regions Chaucer's England was steadily sending out its lines, will certainly illuminate to some degree the probabilities involved, as well as possibly throw light on other matters more important still. For just as in northern Italy, to take a somewhat parallel case, the eleventh-century baptismal names drawn from the Carlovingian epics testify to the passage of the *materia di Francia* into Italy along the *strade franchisesche* (the pilgrim-routes to Rome)²—just as, indeed, to come still closer, unmistakable Russian peltries, still to be seen in portraits painted in England by Hans Holbein from 1526 to 1534, give evidence of trade relations with northern and eastern Russia

the government of Perm; Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 462, for Mohammedan coins, ranging from 698 to 1010, A. D., discovered in the valley of the Petchora. See also the references on p. 34, n. 3.

¹ Laing, *Sagas of the Norse Kings*, III, 90-98; 118-23, cf. I, 117; Rafn, *Antiquités russes*, I, 333-44, 448-59; Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 34, 88-92.

² Pio Rajna, "Li origini delle famiglie padovane a gli eroi dei romanzi cavallereschi," *Romania*, IV, 161-83; H. Morf, "Vom Rolandslied zum Orlando Furioso," *Deutsche Rundschau*, June, 1898, pp. 370-89, especially 376 ff.

antedating Richard Chancellor's voyage¹—so it seems to be (if we may waive for the moment the Desert of Lop) a perfectly reasonable and sober conjecture that in Chaucer's Dry Sea we may recognize a similar bit of evidence for earlier, if vague, knowledge of a region commonly believed to have remained unknown in England until two centuries later. How inherently improbable such ignorance is, becomes clear so soon as one recalls that for more than a century and a quarter before 1369 the overland trade-routes that converged at Novgorod ("Lord Novgorod the Great," the Holmgard [Hólmgarðr] of the sagas)² had had established terminals in England. And Novgorod, we must remember, looked two ways.

On the one side, even during the period of the sagas, its trade-routes drained the very regions where our present interest lies. "Its traders spread over all that we now call the North of Russia, to the coast of Lapland, the North Sea, the Dvina, and the Petchora," and even into the lower valley of the Ob. "At the end of the ninth century, or the beginning of the tenth, the men of Novgorod had already penetrated into the basin of the Northern Dvina; from about the year 1000 they begin their visits to the more distant Petchora."³ By the year 1096 the Petchora region had become tributary to Novgorod; and a few years later Jugria followed.⁴ In 1187 the northern trade was lost through an uprising of the natives, but by 1264 the lost regions were tributary again, and so remained until the fall of Novgorod in 1477.⁵ That the Russian name *Suchoi More*, accordingly—which, to judge from all analogies of newly opened countries, we may feel fairly certain was given soon after the Russians themselves appeared at the mouths of the rivers—could have been applied before the mid-

¹ Hamel, *England and Russia* (1854), p. 115.

² For evidence of Scandinavian and Russian relations in general during the saga period, see Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 37, n. 2.

³ Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 38.

⁴ Rabot, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

⁵ Rabot, *loc. cit.*; Sommier, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-26, 39, 40; Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 39. Moreover, Kholmogori—the great market town Colmogro of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century navigators, by some claimed as the true Hólmgarðr of the sagas (e.g., Rabot, *op. cit.*, p. 163; the editors of *Early Voyages and Travels to Russia and Persia*, Hakluyt Soc., I, 23, note), situated on an island of the Dvina, scarcely fifty miles from the river's mouth—is as ancient as Novgorod itself, appearing in Russian records as early as 1355-59. See *Early Voyages, loc. cit.* For the early trade relations with Vologhda, on the Dvina, see *ibid.*, p. 26, note.

dle of the fourteenth century to either or both of the two bodies of water which two centuries later (and for nearly two centuries after that) certainly bore it, and that, if so applied, it could and would have been known at Novgorod, admits of little question.

But, that possibility granted, another follows. For on the other side, "along with Bruges and London, Novgorod was from the thirteenth century the greatest Mart of the . . . Hanseatic League in extra-German lands."¹ And from Novgorod to London led highways enough. For us it is particularly important to notice one. Chaucer's Shipman, it will be remembered,

. . . knew wel alle the havenes, as they were,
From Gootlond to the cape of Finistere.²

Now from Gothland (for centuries the focal point of the Baltic trade, touching Arabia, Persia, Greece, Rome, Etruria, as thousands of Roman, Byzantine, Cufic, and other coins found there attest)³ often marked on the old portolanos of the fourteenth century with gold and purple to indicate its wealth and power,⁴ went in the eleventh century the first traders to Novgorod, and in their track the Germans followed.⁵ To its capital Wisby, "the Venice of the North,"⁶ with its forty-eight towers and eighteen churches, was regularly brought in the thirteenth century and locked up in a chest in the Marienkirche the accumulated money from the Deutscher Hof, the center of the Hanseatic trade

¹ Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 40 ff.; cf. Arthur Winckler, *Die deutsche Hansa in Russland* (1886), pp. 7-14; Daenell, *Geschichte der deutschen Hanse in der zweiten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (1897), pp. 44-49; etc.

² A. 407, 408.

³ Schäfer, *Die Hansestädte* (Jena, 1879), pp. 37-39, and especially the references there given, to which may be added Aspelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 325-27; Lindner, *Die deutsche Hanse* (Leipzig, 1899), p. 26; Beazley, *op. cit.*, II, 17, 18, 462-64.

⁴ Nordenskiöld, *Facsimile Atlas*, p. 52; *Periplus*, p. 85, cf. p. 103. On the *Mappemonde des Freres Pegiboni*, of 1367, (Jomard, *Les monuments de la géographie*, Nos. 46, 47), beside Gothland is the inscription: "Insulla in qua sunt nonaginta parochie." See also Nordenskiöld, *Facsimile Atlas*, p. 52, for the same inscription on the map of Bianco, 1436.

⁵ Schäfer, *Die Hanse* (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1903), pp. 20-22; Stein, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Hanse* (Giessen, 1900), p. 3; Lindner, *op. cit.*, p. 29. Nothing could better give the spirit of these old traders—the spirit, indeed, of one phase of Chaucer's own times—than the motto over the door of the "Seefahrt" in Bremen: *Navigare necesse est, vivere non est necesse*.

⁶ "Chaucer's Shipman" (*Essays on Chaucer*, Chaucer Soc., p. 484). See extremely interesting illustrations of the city, as it still stands, in Schäfer, *Die Hanse*, Figs. 8-23, and a large plate, giving a view of it in its glory, in the sumptuous *Théâtre des cités du monde* [Georg Bruin, Bruxelles, 1574], Livre quatriesme, No. 39.

at Novgorod—to which chest the representatives of Lübeck, Soest, and Dortmund also held keys.¹ To Gothland, accordingly, all manner of Russian tales might come. But in 1235 merchants of Gothland are mentioned in England, and in 1237 Henry III gave them freedom of trade in the kingdom.² That “good felawes” like Chaucer’s Shipman should pick up bits of geographic lore that had come down by Novgorod and Wisby from this fourteenth-century Hudson’s Bay is precisely what we should expect. I have selected Gothland because Chaucer himself refers to it. But of the other havens which the Shipman knew, such great Hanse towns as Lübeck, Hamburg, Bruges, and Bremen stood in most intimate trade relations with both Novgorod and London.³ As early as the time of Henry II, in Fitz-Stephen’s *Description of London* the following statement occurs: “Ad hanc urbem ex omni natione quae sub caelo est, navalia gaudent institores habere commercia. Aurum mittit Arabs . . . Seres purpureas vestes. Norwegi, Russi, varium grisium, sabelinas: Galli sua vina.”⁴ Into the well-known details there is no need to enter here, but it is merely putting such details on their fair inference to suggest that it is quite within the range of possibility that, just as the ancient western-European and Eastern coins and Byzantine vases dug up on the far northern coasts of Russia bear witness to the early trade of Bjarmia,⁵ so Chaucer’s phrase may be a solitary waif from the same old trading-routes, as they focused at Novgorod.

¹ Schäfer, *Die Hanse*, p. 22; *Die Hansestädte*, p. 45; Riesenkampff, *Der deutsche Hof zu Novgorod* (Dorpat, 1854), p. 17.

² Schäfer, *Die Hansestädte*, p. 62; *Die Hanse*, p. 24; Lindner, *op. cit.*, pp. 56, 57. See the reference to the English and the Gothlanders quoted from Marcus Beneventanus, in Nordenskiöld, *Facsimile Atlas*, p. 66, and the passage from Matthew Paris referred to in the present paper, p. 39, n. 13.

³ Lübeck, for instance, which in the fourteenth century had outstripped Wisby in the Russian trade, had its own house in London after 1277; Hamburg had had one from 1266 (Schäfer, *Die Hansestädte*, pp. 63, 64). From the middle of the twelfth century the merchants of Cologne had held the Gaildhall in London (*ibid.*, p. 64). See, in general, the works already cited, and add Kunze, *Hanseakten aus England 1275 bis 1412* (*Hansische Geschichtsquellen*, Vol. VI, 1891). On early Danish trade with Russia see Beazley, *op. cit.* II, 521.

⁴ Quoted in part in *Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Yule-Cordier, II, 488; see Stow, *Survey of London*, (1720), II, Appendix, p. 10.

⁵ Englehardt, *A Russian Province of the North* (1899), p. 255. See in the present paper p. 31, n. 5; p. 34, n. 3.

Moreover, it must further be remembered that for a century and a half before the time we are concerned with, the order of Teutonic Knights had been in close relations with England on the one hand, and, through Prussia and Lithuania, with Russia on the other,¹ and that Chaucer's Knight—whose itinerary, as has been already remarked, has striking points of contact with the setting of the lines under discussion—had "reysed" both "in Lettow . . . and in Ruce." That a few years later, in 1390, one of Chaucer's own circle, the Earl of Derby, afterward Henry IV, in whose company were also Chaucer's friends Otho de Granson, Piers Bukton, and Sir Lewis Clifford, actually made such an expedition, seems at least to show how little remote such sources of information were from the Englishmen of Chaucer's time.² And it is surely a very mechanical attitude indeed toward Chaucer's vivid rehearsal of the journeys of his Knight which does not feel in it the poet's own personal interest in whatever might be "couth in sondry londres."³

¹ See especially Winckler, *Die Hansa in Russland* (1886), pp. 12, 13; Daenell, *op. cit.* p. 46; Toulmin-Smith, *Derby Accounts*, pp. xi ff.; Lindner, *op. cit.*, p. 60; etc.

² Nor should one forget such men as Guillebert de Lannoy, long in the English service, who in 1403 made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land; in 1405-8 fought, like the Knight, the Moors in Spain; in 1411 visited Granada; in 1413 "reysed" (he uses the very word) in Prussia; and in the same year visited Novgorod and later traveled in Lithuania and Wallachia. See his own narrative in Joachim Lelewel, *Guillebert de Lannoy et ses Voyages* (Brussels, 1844).

³ There is a very curious and puzzling chain of circumstantial evidence, involving at one point an acquaintance of the poet's, which, could it be substantiated, would bring probable information about these very Northern Seas almost to Chaucer's door, a few years before the *Book of the Duchess* was written. On the epoch-making *Universalior orbis cogniti tabula* of Ruysch, printed in the Ptolemy of 1508 (see facsimile in Nordenskiöld, *Facsimile Atlas to the Early History of Cartography*, Stockholm, 1889, Plate XXXII, cf. pp. 63-66; bibliography in Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History*, III, 9; cf. Winsor, *Bibliography of Ptolemy's Geography*, in *Bibl. Contribs.*, *Harv. Univ. Library*, No. 18, p. 7), among other legends of the utmost interest occurs the following, in the north polar regions: "Logere est in libro de inventione fortunati sub polo arctico rupem esse excelsam ex lapide magnete 33 milliarium germanorum ambitu. Hanc complectitur Mare Sugenum fluidum instar vasis aquam deorsum per foramina emittentis." Passing the interesting problem of the Mare Sugenum, what was the *Liber de inventione fortunati*?

At the foot of Gerard Mercator's great map of the northern regions, of 1569 (Jomard, *Les monuments de la géographie*, No. 78; Nordenskiöld, *Facsimile Atlas*, p. 95) is the following legend (the full Latin text and the English translation here used are in the *Principal Navigations*, Hakluyt Soc., I, 301, 302; the text also in Lelewel, II, 231): "Touching the description of the North partes, I have taken the same out of the voyage of James Cnoyen of Hartzevan Buske . . . and the most part and chiefest things among the rest, he learned of a certaine priest in the king of Norways court, in the yeere 1364. This priest . . . reported that in the yeere 1360, a certaine English Frier, a Franciscan, and a Mathematician of Oxford, came into those Islands, who leaving them, and passing further by his Magicall Arte, described all those places that he sawe, and tooke the height of them with his

But once more, so known, the region would be projected, as in the earlier days of the sagas, against an Asiatic background. The later explorers of the sixteenth century found the country full of hints of mysterious routes to Cathay by way of Jugria. Josias Logan in 1611 wrote to Hakluyt, as "the greatest secret," of vast rivers beyond the Dvina and the Petchora of which he had heard from the Samoyeds, and gathered they were not far from Cataia and China.¹ Mercator in 1580 wrote to Hakluyt of those same rivers

Astrolabe." The Norwegian priest, Nordenskiöld (*Facsimile Atlas*, p. 95, note) suggested, might have been Ivar Baardson; the English friar was apparently the author of the *Liber de inventione fortunati*. For the extracts which Mercator made from James Cnoyen of Bois-le-Duc—whose book, like the *Liber*, is also lost; see Mercator's account in Hakluyt (ed. Hakluyt Soc., III, 281) of his bad luck with it—he sent in 1577 to the famous English mathematician and astrologer John Dee, and those extracts are preserved in the British Museum (*MS Cotton*, Vitell. C. vii, fols. 264-69; see *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XL, 418). Dee's testimony may be read in Hakluyt (ed. Hakluyt Soc.), I, 303, 304: "Anno 1360 . . . a friar of Oxford, being a good Astronomer, went in companie with others to the most Northern Islands of the world, and there leaving his company together, hee travailed alone, and purposely described all the Northern Islands, with the indrawing seas: and the record thereof at his returne he delivered to the King of England. The name of which booke is Inventio Fortunata (aliter fortunatus) qui liber incipit a gradu 54 usque ad polum. Which friar for sundry purposes after that did five times passe from England thither and home againe." The account ends with mention of early English trade with Iceland.

Is it possible, however, to determine who this "clerk of Oxenford" was? On Richard Hakluyt's sole authority it is, for he heads his citation of Dr. Dee's account with the following words: "A Testimonie of the learned Mathematician master John Dee, touching the foresaid voyage of Nicholas De Linna" (I, 303). Now, in the *Treatise on the Astrolabe*, as everybody knows, Chaucer writes to "litel Lewis" that, among other things mentioned, his third part shall contain "many another notable conclusioun, after the kalendres of the reverent clerkes, frere I. Somer and frere N. Lenne" (Prol. III). If Hakluyt's identification be correct, then the friar who, traveling alone, "described all those places that he sawe, and tooke the height of them with his Astrolabe," was the very clerk from whom Chaucer later drew "many a . . . notable conclusioun" regarding the astrolabe; and we may be further very certain that the man who at the Tabard, by the time "the sonne was to reste," had so spoken with his comrades "everychon That [he] was of hir felawshipe anon" would have known more about this "reverent frere" than his Kalendre!

The fullest discussion of the problem is that of B. F. Da Costa in *Bull. Am. Geog. Soc.*, 1881 (privately printed as *Inventio Fortunata*, New York, 1881), which accepts Hakluyt's identification without question. It is especially valuable for its collection of such facts as are known of Nicholas of Lynne and for its bibliography (pp. 173-75); for its discussion of early English trade with Iceland (pp. 165-72); and for its list of later references to the *Inventio* (pp. 184 ff.). The latest discussion seems to be that in Nordenskiöld's *Periplus* (1897), pp. 95, 96, which assigns the voyage, with that of Giraldus Cambrensis, to "the romances of geographical literature," though admitting that "their stories seem, however, to have been based on actual voyages in the open ocean, and therefore deserve a place in the history of navigation." A. G. Little, in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. "Nicholas of Lynne" (XL, 418) briefly summarizes the case, and concludes that "no evidence has been discovered to connect, as Hakluyt does, the unnamed Franciscan of Oxford with the Carmelite Nicholas. Dee suggests that he may have been the Minorite Hugo of Ireland, a traveller who flourished and wrote about 1360." All one can say, accordingly, much as one might wish to say more, seems to be that about 1360 some such voyage was probably made, of which Chaucer might readily have heard. To Da Costa's full bibliography may be added Brae, *Treatise on the Astrolabe*, p. 21, note; Skeat, *Treatise on the Astrolabe*, p. 73; Oxford Chaucer, III, 353; Nordenskiöld, *Facsimile Atlas*, pp. 64, 95 note, 136.

¹ Purchas his Pilgrime, III, 548.

to the east, navigable into the heart of the continent.¹ In 1559 a Permian declared to Giles Holmes that he had actually thus gone to Cathay.² In 1525 Dmitry Gerassimow reported to Paulus Jovius, from "the fabulous narrations of merchants," rumors of a north route to Cathay.³ In his *Rerum Muscovitarum Commentarii*, Herberstein, who was in Russia in 1517 and 1526, translates literally a Russian merchant itinerary to the Lake of Kitai (just beyond which on his map lies Cambalik) through the country of Jugria and Lucomorya, quoting, as things by universal account held to be true, the tale of the people of Lucomorya, who die on November 27 and come to life again like frogs on April 24;⁴ of the Slatá Baba, or "Golden Old Woman;"⁵ and of "a certain fish, with a head, eyes, nose, mouth, hands, feet, and in other respects almost entirely resembling a man."⁶ Thus we are brought steadily back toward Chaucer's times, and always the region is full of rumors of the East.

But in Chaucer's own day there existed real and very close connection with the heart of central Asia. The Mongol invasions of Russia in the first half of the thirteenth century concern us here only as they affected, for England, let us say, the geographic *mise en scène* of the farther North. That Asia must have loomed large behind it is clear enough. Eastern Mongolia in the thirteenth century "was connected with Persia and Russia by great highways through Central Asia."⁷ Over these roads passed couriers and envoys from Western kingdoms to Caracorum, in the depths of Mongolia, the capital of the great Khan.⁸ When John Carpini in 1246 came to the tent of Cuyne Khan, near Caracorum,

¹ *Principal Navigations* (Hakluyt Soc.), III, 279.

² *Ibid.*, II, 482.

³ *Notes on Russia* (Hakluyt Soc.), II, 248.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 40; cf. p. 37. Cf. the people in the land of Prester John, who are rejuvenated every hundred years (Z. I, 913 [E], §§ 3-5).

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 41; *Purchas*, III, 443; Nordenskiöld's *Periplus*, Plate XXXV, and numerous other old maps of Russia.

⁶ *Notes on Russia*, II, 41, 42. Curiously enough, these human fishes appear also in the land of Prester John, where they go, by night, out of the water, "ac ex collisione lapidum ignem excutiunt et ligna juxta aquas comburunt, et alios pisces ad splendorem ignis attrahunt et eos capiunt et comedunt." (*Tractatus pulcherrimus*, Z. II, 177). See also the account in the *Epistola* (Interpolation D) of the fishes like *destriers* and palfreys and mules, which the Amazons ride by day, and permit to return to the water by night, as well as of the fishes like dogs and falcons, with which they hunt (Z. I, 917 [D], k).

⁷ Bretschneider, *op. cit.*, I, 4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I, p. 5.

"without the doore stooode Duke Ieroslaus of Susdal, in Russia."¹ When seven years later, in 1253, William de Rubruquis arrived on his mission at the court of the great Khan, he found in his camp near Caracorum a Hungarian servant, who recognized his order,² and a woman from Metz in Lorraine, Paquette by name;³ in Caracorum itself he found a certain master goldsmith, William Buchier, a native of Paris, whose brother was still living on the Grand Pont, and whose wife was a daughter of Lorraine, but born in Hungary.⁴ There was also "another person, Basil by name, the son of an Englishman, but born in Hungary;"⁵ there was the nephew of a Norman bishop;⁶ a German female slave;⁷ and a poor German with three children.⁸ The Chinese annals for 1330 record a settlement of Russians near Pekin, and a Russian regiment was in the Chinese emperor's life-guard.⁹ The North and the Far East were being brought strangely close together. Machault could speak of "le quens de Tartarie A qui Lestoé est tributaire,"¹⁰ while "in the land of Tartarye," the Squire well knew, "ther dwelte a king that werreyed Russye." And with "le quens de Tartarie" just the Northern coasts with which we are concerned had very definite associations. In the reign of Haakon II of Norway (1217-63) Torfæus records a great migration of Bjarmians to Norway, driven out by the Mongols;¹¹ while Matthew Paris relates that in 1238 the people of Gothland and Friesland, fearing their attack, did not come to England, to Yarmouth, as their custom was,¹² at the time for catching herring.¹³ What background, then, the region of the *Suchoi More* carried with it, is evident.

¹ Carpini and Rubruquis (ed. Hakluyt Soc.), p. 136, cf. pp. 292 ff.; Bretschneider, *op. cit.*, II, 76, 77.

² *The Journey of Friar William of Rubruck* (ed. Hakluyt Soc., 1900), p. 168.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 176.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 177, 187, 207, 208, 211, 212, 215, 222, 223, 247, 253, 254.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 245.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 247.

⁹ Bretschneider, *op. cit.*, II, 80, 81.

¹⁰ Ed. Tarbé, p. 106.

¹¹ "Multi Biarmorum, Tartarorum saevitiam fugientes, sponte ad eum [i. e., Haakon] venerunt."—Torfæus, *Historia Rerum Norvegicarum* (1711), IV, 303; cf. d'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols* (1834), pp. 185, 186; Carpini and Rubruquis (ed. Hakluyt Soc.), p. 285.

¹² Note the incidental confirmation of the relations between Gothland and England; cf. pp. 34, 35.

¹³ "Unde Gothiam et Frisiam inhabitantes, impetus eorum pertimentes, in Angliam, ut moris est eorum, apud Gernemue, tempore allecis capiendi, quo suas naves solebant onerare non venerunt."—*Chronica Majora* (Rolls Series), III, 488. In the same year Saracen ambassadors asked English aid against the Tartars.

VI

Here, then, is what we have: a veritable Dry Sea on the sides of the North, with mysterious trade-routes and Mongol highways stretching dimly into central Asia; in central Asia a veritable Carrenar, on the edge of an older Dry Sea sweeping off, like the tail of a comet, a year's journey somewhere toward the North. What does it mean?

To understand what possibly it may mean (and whether the specific point at issue prove to be right or wrong, the effort may illuminate no less the surer ground) we must divest our minds utterly of every impression derived from modern maps. For what we have to realize is *Chaucer's* world—its names and places, not where the twentieth century knows they are, but where the fourteenth century imagined them to be. How did the world as he knew it really lie in Chaucer's mind? What mental *image du monde* did he probably possess, on which such new facts as the Dry Sea or the Carrenar would be assigned a more or less definite position? I have already referred to Troilus's vision from the seventh sphere of "this litel spot of erthe *that with the see Enbraced is*," and to the line declaring Rosamunde "of al beaute shryne *As fer as cercled is the mappemounde*." And it is really Chaucer's *mappemounde* with which we have to do. How it must have lain in his mind one realizes vividly enough on turning the pages of Santarem's great *Atlas*,¹ where in scores of *mappemondes* Europe, Asia, and Africa lie folded close together, three cells within the circle of the Ocean stream, like the embryo of the later world. Gower, in that treatise on the education of Alexander which quite explains Chaucer's panic-stricken rejection of the Eagle's offer of instruction in astronomy, speaks of setting

. . . . properly the bounde
After the forme of Mappemounde,
Thurgh which the ground be pourparties
Departed is in thre parties,
That is Asie, Aufrique, Europe,
The whiche under the hevene cope,
Als ferr as streccheth eny ground,
Begripeth al this Erthe round.²

¹ *Atlas de Mappemondes, Portolanos, etc.* (Paris, 1842-53).

² *Confessio Amantis*, VII, 529-36 (ed. Macaulay, III, 247).

Europe and Africa form the northern and southern quarters respectively of the western half of the habitable world, while the whole of the other segment is given up to Asia,¹

For that partie was the beste
And double as moche as othre tuo.²

Between Europe and Asia the Tanais, the modern Don, forms the boundary line, and

Fro that into the worldes ende
Estward, Asie it is algates,
Til that men come unto the gates
Of Paradis, and there ho!³

And about it all lies

. . . . thilke See which hath no wane
[Y.] cleped the gret Océane.⁴

Such were the outlines of Chaucer's *mappemonde*,⁵ into that scheme new facts must have been fitted and in its light interpreted. For fixed conventions ruled here as in all else, and precisely as a hundred poets spoke the language of the *Romance of the Rose*, so the Middle Ages in general believed in their own geographical discoveries, as Humboldt has observed,⁶ only in so far as some hint of them was already given in the authors of antiquity. How Chaucer visualized the Dry Sea and the Carrenar,

¹The general outline was often expressed by a T within an O, thus: ⑦. See, for instance, the following passage, quoted in Yule's *Travels of Marco Polo*, ed. Cordier, I, 121:

Un T dentro ad un O mostra il disegno
Come in tre parti fu diviso il Mondo,
E la superiore è il maggior regno
Che quasi piglia la metà de tondo.
ASIA chiamata: il gambo ritto è segno
Che parte il terzo nome dal secondo
AFERICA dico da EUROPA: il mare
Mediterran tra esse in mezzo appare.
—*La Sfera*, di F. Leonardo di Stagio Dati, Lib. iii, st. 11.

²*Confessio*, VII, 558, 559.

³*Confessio*, 568-71.

⁴*Ibid.*, 591, 592. All that Gower says, however, he borrowed from the *Trésor* of Brunetto Latini, as Mr. Macaulay has pointed out (*op. cit.*, p. 522). See ed. Chabaille, 1863, pp. 151-53. Cf. Santarem, *Histoire de la cartographie* (Paris, 1849), I, 82, 83, and in general the sections on the cosmographers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, I, 75-151 (cf. 179-90), and the full accounts, in the second and third volumes, of the *mappemondes* collected in the *Atlas*. See, too, the account of John de Marignolli (1338) in Yule, *Cathay*, II, 371-73, and the figure there given. Of value for Chaucer's geography is Dr. Moore's essay on "The Geography of Dante," in *Studies in Dante*, Third Series (Oxford, 1903), pp. 109 ff.

⁵For the cosmographers of Chaucer's time, including Vincent of Beauvais, Alain de l'Isle, and others, see Santarem, *op. cit.*, I, 77 ff.

⁶*Kritische Untersuchungen*, I, 116 (quoted in Nordenskiöld, *Periplus*, p. 161); cf. Moore, *op. cit.*, pp. 142, 143; Yule, *Travels of Marco Polo*, I, 129-31.

then, was necessarily determined by the geographical conventions of his time, with the surrounding Ocean as the plane of reference.

On that Ocean would be placed, of course, the Russian *Suchoi more*, were it known at all. But the surprising thing is that the *other* Dry Sea, which we know to lie in the heart of the continent, was thought of as likewise on the Ocean stream. For almost uniformly on the older maps the Desert of Lop and the province of Tangut by which it lay are found, when they occur at all, directly on the Northern Ocean, where they stay, with some exceptions, until the beginning of the seventeenth century.¹ And on the earliest map on which Lop is named (that of Johannes Leardus, of 1448) from Lop straight to Russia and the head of the Baltic, and occupying all the northern zone of the map south of the Ocean rim, stretches a desert marked in great characters in red ink, *Dixerto dexabitado per fredo*.² Sixty-seven years later, on Reisch's map in the *Margarita philosophia* of 1515, between *Tartaria Tangut* on the Northern Sea and *Russia alba* there still extends a desert marked *Desertum magnum per centum dietas*,³ while on a map of unknown authorship,⁴ of about 1540, *Tangut provin.* is directly connected by a *desertum magnum* with Russia.⁵

Is it inconceivable that Chaucer may perhaps have supposed the Dry Sea of which he had possibly heard the name, lying vaguely somewhere in the North, to be the western end of the

¹ See, in addition to the maps noted in the text, in Nordenskiöld's *Facsimile Atlas* the maps from the 1513 Ptolemy (Plate XXXV), from Laurentius Frisius, 1522 (Plate XXXIX), from Oronotius Finæus, 1531 (Plate XLI)—where the Desert of Lop runs nearly around to Florida!—and from Cornelius de Judeis, 1593 (Plate XLVIII). The 1508 map of Ruysch (Plate XXXI) puts Caracorum up on the edge of the Mare Sugenum, and that of Sim. Grynaeus, 1532 (Plate XLII), places the Desertum Belgium where Tangut usually lies.

² See the map itself in Santerem's *Atlas*, and in Nordenskiöld's *Periplus*, p. 61. Cf. Santerem, *op. cit.*, III, 410, 417.

³ *Facsimile-Atlas*, Plate XXXVIII.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Plate XL.

⁵ Nor are the relative distances less amazing. On the beautiful illuminated map from the *Grand chroniques de St. Denis* (1364-72) Hungary lies equidistant from Germany and the Castle of Gog and Magog, all on the Ocean stream. On the map of Andrea Bianco, 1436 (*Periplus*, p. 19; cf. Santarem, III, 377), the tent of Koublai-Khan, ("Imperion de medio, id est Cocobalech") is at the same distance from the "Imperio Rosie Magna" as Sweden. On the map of Fra Mauro of 1459 (Santarem, *Atlas*; also ed. Zurla, Venice, 1806; Nordenskiöld, *Voyage of the Vega*, II, 155; cf. *Periplus*, p. 62) the desert of Lop lies east of Sarray and Russia, at a less distance than England, while Tangut is not so far from the Mar Bianco as the least width of England on the same map.

great and terrible desert to which the name had long before been applied?¹ If he did, to "go hoodles² to the Drye See And come home by the Carrenar" was a remarkable anticipation of that long-sought northeast route to Cathay, the failure to find which led eventually to the discovery of the New World.³

And, strangely enough, there is another possible associative link in just such a chain. For in the narrative of Johannes de Hese (1389) the *Mare arenosum* is brought into direct connection with another of the fabulous seas of the Middle Ages—the famous *Lebermeer*, which plays so startling a part in the adventures of Herzog Ernst, enters into the story of the Grail and the legend of St. Brandan, and stands, like the Sandy Sea itself, in mediæval literature as "aen de uiterste grenzen der wereld."⁴ The discussion of the origins of this *mare coagulatum, spissum, pigrum*—*das geronnene Meer, la mer betée*⁵—in which ships so unfortunate as to have entered it cannot move from the place, does not belong here;⁶ what we are concerned with is the fact that the *Lebermeer* was thought of as lying far to the north, "in den hohen nordwesten Europas." Only one of many testimonies need

¹ Curiously enough, there was another possible association between the two, for the Mongol *kara* appears in the records along with the *Suchoi More*. Josias Logan wrote to Hakluyt in 1611 of four rivers, "the Eastermost whereof they call *Cara Reca*, or the *Blacke River*" (*Purchas his Pilgrims*, III, 546). The same river John Balak, writing to Mercator in 1581 (*Principal Navigations*, ed. Hakluyt Soc., III, 451), Anthony March in 1584 (*Purchas*, III, 805), and Randolph's commission of 1588 (*Principal Navigations*, ed. Hakluyt Soc., III, 120) had named without translating. If the one name had reached England, the other, of course, might have come too.

² That "hoodles" has any other suggestion than that of a certain romantic disregard for comfort or even defiance of hardship, in carrying out the task enjoined, seems scarcely probable.

³ If the northern Dry Sea, itself perhaps called to his mind by Machault's *arbre sec* (see p. 9), merely suggested to him the fresh application of that name to the well-known Sandy Sea, which then recalled the Kara-nor, the situation is still interesting enough.

⁴ Blommaert, *Oudvlaemsche Gedichten* (1838), I, 93, n. 1.

⁵ See for references Lexer, *Mhd. Handwörterbuch*, s. v. "lüber-mer;" Müller and Zarncke *Mhd. Wörterbuch*, s. v., "Meer, lebermer;" Verwijs and Veldman, *Middelnederlandsche Woodenboek* (1899), IV, 446, s. v. "Leversee;" Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, VI, 463, cf. V, 1051; Godefroy, I, 641, s. v. "beter;" Sainte Palaye, II, 475. See further Bartsch, in his edition of *Herzog Ernst*, pp. cxliv ff., especially cxlv-viii (cf. cxxxiv ff.); von der Hagen, *Deutsche Gedichte des Mittelalters* (ed. Hagen and Büsching), [Part iii], pp. xii-xiii, and at greater length in *Museum f. altdeutsche Litteratur*, I, 282-311, especially 293-98; Haupt's *Zeitschrift*, VII, 276, 296; Mallenhoff and Scherer, *Denkmäler* (1864), pp. 69, 348, 349; (1873), pp. 71, 388, 389; K. Hoffmann, *Sitzungsberichte der Münchner Academie*, 1865, II, 1-19. For the connection with St. Brandan, see K. Schröder, *Sanct Brandan* (Erlangen, 1871), p. 167, cf. p. xv; Blommaert, *op. cit.*, pp. 92, 93.

⁶ See especially Mallenhoff, *loc. cit.*; Bartsch, *loc. cit.*

be cited: "De oceano Britannico qui Danaim tangit et Nordmanniam magna recitantur a nautis miracula, quod circa Orchades mare sit concretum et ita spissum a sale ut vix moveri possint naves nisi tempestatis auxilio, unde etiam vulgariter idem salum lingua nostri *Libersee* vocatur."¹ Furthermore, the *Lebermeer* was (not to enter into its other wonders) from the earliest times associated with the legend of the Magnetic Mountain,² which naturally offered a fabulous-rationalistic explanation of the behavior of the ships. And so associated, the *Lebermeer* finds itself not only in the North, but in the Orient!³ It is there, for instance, that Herzog Ernst—not to speak of Reinfrid von Braunschweig—has his adventure in the *Lebermeer* with the *Schnabelleute* and the Griffins;⁴ it is there that the *Lebermeer* dissolves before the Grail like ice;⁵ it is there, finally, that it is brought into direct connection with the *Mare arenosum*. Johannes de Hese's account is as follows:

Et ulterius navigando de mare Aethyopiae infra maria jecoreum et arenosum per quatuor dietas veni ad terram monocolorum. Et mare iecoreum est talis naturae, quod attrahit naves in profundum propter ferrum in navibus, quia fundus illius maris dicitur quod sit lapideus de lapide adamante, qui est attractivus. Et ex alia parte est mare arenosum . . . et eidem monoculi transeunt eciam aliquando sub aqua periclitando naves. Et propter ista duo maria, infra quae navigare oportet, est periculosissimum navigare, etc.⁶

The characteristics of the two seas were, it is clear, sufficiently

¹ Schol. 144, Adam von Bremen, 4. 34. See Müllenhoff, *loc. cit.*; Bartsch, *loc. cit.* Like the Dry Sea itself, it seems to have sprung from mysterious, because not understood, experience of actual fact, and to have become, as van den Bergh says, "verfabeld" (*Myth. Wdbk.*, p. 128). See particularly, in this connection, the very interesting discussion of the subject by Rudolph Much in Haupt's *Anzeiger*, XXIV, 321-23 (1898) in the light of certain experiences of Nansen in the "Fram" with *dødwand*, or "totwasser."

² See Bartsch, *op. cit.*, pp., cxlvi ff.; Müllenhoff, *loc. cit.*; and especially A. Graf, *Miti, leggende e superstizioni del medio evo*, 1893, II, 363 ff. In the present connection it is particularly worth noting that on Ruysch's map, whose relation to Chaucer's time has been already discussed (p. 36, n. 3), the *Mare Sugenum* surrounds the magnetic rock, and that to the north of Iceland one finds the legend: "Hic compassus navium non tenet, nec naves quae ferrum tenent revertere valent."

³ See especially Bartsch, *op. cit.*, p. cxlviii, for the oriental origin of the legend of the Magnetic Mountain.

⁴ Ed. Bartsch, str. 3390 ff., especially 3935; ed. Hagen und Bäsching, str. 3000 ff., especially 3210.

⁵ See p. 12, n. 2.

⁶ Z. II, 164, cf. 160.

alike to render their association a most natural one,¹ and it is a matter of the utmost interest that in Chaucer's time such an association actually occurs. The *Lebermeer* itself becomes, then, another possible middle term between the Dry Sea in the East, with which we find it definitely associated, and the far northern coasts, where still more frequently it seems to have been placed. At all events, in it we seem to have once more a curious and most suggestive meeting-point of two streams of mediæval travel-lore—the one from the farthest North, the other from the remoter East. And so far forth, at least, its behavior makes less wildly improbable than might otherwise seem the suggestion hazarded connecting the *Suchoi More* and the Sandy Sea.²

If, however, the *Suchoi More* was utterly unknown to Chaucer, the identification of the Dry Sea and the Carrenar with the Desert of Gobi and the Kara-Nor remains untouched, and gives us fresh evidence for Chaucer's day "wie sehr," as Goethe said in the case of John of Hildesheim, "die Einbildungskraft gegen Indien gerichtet war; wie sie in jenen fernen Landen als in einem Irrgarten herumtaumelte und, um halbgekannte Personen, Länder, und Städte zu bezeichnen, neue wunderliche Namen erfand oder die echten seltsam verunstaltete"—evidence, too, which shows how strangely a bit of unsuspected fact might now and then emerge from that very chaos of the fabulous. It demonstrates

¹I am indebted to Professor Kittredge for calling my attention to the fact that the *Lebermeer*, like the Dry Sea, was used in the phrase "jusque en la mer betée" as a synonym for the remote limits of the world. See Guillaume le Clerc's *Fergus* (ed. Martin), p. 74, ll. 2699 ff.:

Las! s'or le cuidoie trover
En nule terre, jel querroie:
Jamais nul jor ne fineroie
De si que l'aroie trovee.
Nom, dusques en la Mer Betee
N'est nus si perilleus sentiers
U je n'alaisse volentiers
Querre le mius vaillant dou monde.

(Cf. also *idem*, ed. Michel, p. 97, which has, instead of the second line quoted: "Em Bretagne n'en Orkenoie"). See particularly the long list of similar passages in Godefroy, I, 641, s. v. "beter."

²Of the many interesting general references to the *Lebermeer* I shall add but one, which oddly parallels such invocations to the Virgin as I had occasion to cite in an article on the *Prologue* to the *Legend of Good Women* (*Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, xix, 624, 625):

Maria, muter, reine maget,
die sam der morgenstern taget
dem wiselosen armen her,
daz uf dem wilden leber-mer
der grundlosen werlt swebet,
du bist ein licht, das immer lebet, etc.

—Conrad von Würzburg, *Die goldene Schmiede* (*Altd. Wälder*, 2, 221).

again, moreover, what cannot be too strongly emphasized, the fact that sources other than the *books* Chaucer read—sources that lie in his intercourse with men and in his reaction upon the interests, the happenings, the familiar matter of his day—entered likewise into “that large compasse of his,” and must be taken into account in estimating his work.¹ But perhaps the paramount value of the lines is, after all, just the fact itself that out of this very mass of vivid human interests which a long night has swallowed up, because, unlike these waifs, they lacked their bard—that out of those once absorbing interests they have preserved for us these bits of flotsam and jetsam, *rara nantia in gurgite vasto*.

JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

¹ May we not hope that Professor Manly's long-promised paper “dealing . . . with the question of Chaucer's relations to some men who had travelled a good deal” (*Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XI, p. 362, note) may yet appear, to throw further light on this neglected side of Chaucer's activity?

SOME EXAMPLES OF FRENCH AS SPOKEN BY ENGLISHMEN IN OLD FRENCH LITERATURE

French as spoken by an English mouth has been proverbial since Chaucer humorously described the language of his prioress as French

After the scole of Stratford atte Bowe,
For Frenssh of Parys was to hire unknowe.

Yet similar pleasantries had been current long before him. Already Gautier Map in his work,¹ *De nugis curialium*, relates an anecdote in which he laughs at the English pronunciation of French, adding the explanation that "apud Merleburgam fons est, quem si quis, ut aiunt, gustaverit, gallice barbarizat; unde cum viciose quis illa lingua loquitur, dicimus eum loqui gallicum Merleburgae." Various instances of this French of Marlborough have been preserved in Old French literature, and the intrinsic interest which they present prompts me to collect them here. Langlois called attention to several of them in an article entitled "Les Anglais du moyen âge d'après les sources françaises," in the *Revue historique*, 1893, pp. 298 ff., and some have been briefly commented upon by the editors of the texts in which they occur. The collection is probably incomplete, but, such as it is, it may induce others more favorably situated to add similar examples that have escaped my notice.

I am able to cite three strictly literary instances of the use of this French of Marlborough, belonging in round numbers to the thirteenth century: the *Fabliau de deux Angloys et de l'anel*² the story of Renart disguised as an English *jongleur*,³ and the language of the Duke of Gloucester in Philippe de Beaumanoir's poem *Jehan et Blonde*.⁴ To the same general period belong two political documents: the "Song of the Peace with England,"

¹ Published by Thomas Wright (Camden Society, 1850) p. 236.

² Published by Raynaud and Montaiglon, Vol. II, pp. 178-82.

³ *Roman de Renart*, ed. Martin, Vol. I, pp. 62 ff.

⁴ Ed. Suchier, 1885.

1264,¹ and a similar little document of the year 1299, published by Raynaud.² I have no example of the fourteenth century, but in the fifteenth century a portion of the dialogue in the *Mystère de Saint Louis*³ is written in the same amusing jargon. For the purposes of this study it will be convenient to separate the earlier examples from the younger.

The *fabliau* of the two Englishmen is a jest in the style of this category of literature, turning upon an Englishman's pronunciation of the word *aignel* as *anel*. During a visit which two Englishmen make to France one falls sick and is nursed by his comrade. When the crisis is past and the patient begins to recover his health and appetite, he says to his companion

Triant . . . par seint Tomas,
Se tu avez i anel cras
Mi porra bien mengier, ce croi. (25-27)

The comrade sets out at once to find the desired delicacy. Entering a house, he addresses the owner in French:

Au mieulz qu'il onques pot parler;
Mais onc tant ne s'i sot garder
Que n'i entrelardast l'anglois
Ainsi farsisoit le françois. (35-38)

In his best French he asks for an *anel cras*, but the Frenchman fails to understand him. He says to him:

Ge ne sai quel mal fez tu diz:
Va t'en, que tes cors soit honiz!
Es tu Auvergnaz ou Tiois? (49-51)

And the answer comes back

Nai, nai . . . mi fout Anglois. (52)

Then he explains his errand, that he desires to purchase an *anel* for a sick friend. Now the she-ass of the Frenchman has just presented him with a young donkey, and, understanding the Englishman to be in search of such an animal, he sells it to him. The stranger takes it home and prepares it for his convalescent

¹ Published by Thomas Wright, *The Political Songs of England* (Camden Society, 1839) pp. 63-68.

² *Romania*, Vol. XIV, p. 280.

³ Ed. Michel, 1871.

countryman. When the meal is over, the patient begins to suspect the mistake and accuses his friend of having served him some other animal than an *anel*. The skin, with head, ears, and feet, is produced, and when he sees it, the patient exclaims:

Si fait pié, si faite mousel
Ne si fait pel n'a mie ainel.

Cestui n'est mie fils *bèhè*. (99-103)

The friend agrees:

Tu dites voir, par saint Felix,
Foi que ge doi à saint Joban,
Cestui fu filz *ihan, ihan*. (106-8)

When the patient sees what has been done, he laughs so heartily that he recovers his health.

The passage in point in the *Roman de Renart* occurs in the second half of the first branch, commonly known as *Renart teinturier*; a better title would be *Renart jongleur*.

For his offenses Renart has been put under public ban. Anyone finding him is ordered to kill him. During his flight he arrives on the top of a hill, and, turning his face to the east, he prays God to aid him to find a disguise that will conceal him from his pursuers. Presently he arrives before the house of a dyer, who has just prepared his colors for the purpose of dyeing some cloth yellow. Finding the window open, and not aware of the vat which stands on the other side, he jumps into it. When the dyer returns, he induces him very skilfully to aid him to clamber out of the involuntary bath, in which he has almost found his death, and runs away colored a beautiful yellow.

Now he meets his arch-enemy, Ysengrin, but, reassured by the thought that he will not be recognized in his disguise, he resolves to change his language. When the wolf comes up and asks him who he is, Renart replies:

Gode helpe . . . bel sire
Non saver point ton reson dire. (2351, 2352)

and upon the further question whether he is a Frenchman, he answers:

Nai, mi seignor, mais de Bretaing. (2357)

He has lost his companion and his way, has hunted for him through France and England, and wishes now to return to his home, but would first visit Paris, since he has learned to speak French. Ysengrin asks him what his business is, and he replies:

Ya, ge fot molt bon jogler. (2370)

but he has been robbed the day before and has lost his *viel* (i. e., *vielle*). If he could recover it, he would sing; he has not eaten for two days, and his name is *Galopin*. He inquires after the king, suggests that Ysengrin might supply him with a *vielle*, and continues:

Je fot servir molt volenter
Tote la gent de ma mester.
Ge fot savoir bon lai Breton
Et de Merlin et de Noton,
Del roi Artu et de Tristan,
Del chevrefoil, de saint Brandan. (2387-92)

Upon the question whether he knows also the lay of *dam Iset*, he replies:

Ya, ya: goditoët,
Ge fot saver . . . trestoz. (2394, 2395)

Ysengrin then asks whether by chance he has seen Renart, and the fox has to listen to a very uncomplimentary description of himself.

Finally the two set out to steal a *vielle* in the house of a *vilain*, and during this expedition Ysengrin is as usual maltreated, while Renart escapes with the booty. He goes into retirement for a fortnight, learns to play the instrument, and at the end of this period, still in disguise, he arrives at his own home just as his wife, who thinks him dead, is about to marry Poncet, the cousin of Grinbert, the badger. Renart serves as *jongleur* at the wedding. In the evening he plays one of his characteristic tricks upon the bridegroom, and in the end makes his identity known to his wife.

In *Jehan et Blonde* the English dialect comes in with one of the characters of the story. Jehan de Dammartin had left his home to seek fortune in England, had found a protector in the Count of Oxford, and had won the love of Blonde, the count's

daughter. Called back to his home by the news of his mother's death and the serious sickness of his father, he makes an agreement with Blonde that he will return to carry her away a year from their night of parting. In the meantime the Count of Oxford decides to marry her to the Duke of Gloucester, and, as Jehan returns to fulfil his promise, he falls in with the duke, who is on his way to the wedding. The picture of this Englishman is drawn by Philippe de Beaumanoir with not a little skill. He is loud and boisterous, overbearing and patronizing, the very opposite of the sharp, sly, and quiet Frenchman. From the moment that he sees him, he is ready to laugh at the Frenchman, yet his natural stupidity prevents him from appreciating the jokes which the latter aims at him. He receives them with bursts of stupid laughter, and later in the day, when he relates the incidents to the Count of Oxford, he laughs again at the stupid fellow, who had given him such amusement. He is a typical picture of the French conception of the English character.

Meeting the young Frenchman on the highway, he asks him for his name:

Si vaut a lui parler franchois
Mais sa langue torne en Englois. (2635, 2636)

Jehan answers that he is called Gautier, and he replies:

Gautier? Diable! ce fu non sot. (2643)

Then he offers to buy the palfrey which Jehan's squire is leading along upon which Blonde is to escape with him.

Voelle vous vendre? Je cater,
Si vous vol a raison donner.
Il fout mout bel prende deniers. (2649-51)

Jehan sets a price so high that he exclaims:

Nai, par la goiffe biu, nai, nai!
Quo debble! ce sera trop chere.
En vous a bone sote entere.
N'en voelle plus, tiene vous pes. (2658-61)

Presently it begins to rain, and the duke's finery becomes soaked. Jehan laughs, and when the duke asks for the reason of this levity, he replies that a man as rich as he ought always to

carry his house with him, and the Englishman bursts into a shout of stupid laughter. His companions agree:

. . . . tout voir Francis sont
Plus sote c'un nice brebis. (2704, 2705)

On crossing a ford the duke misses the way and falls into the water. Jehan suggests that, if he were as rich as he, he would always carry his bridge with him, and this remark calls forth new shouts of laughter from the English party.

Arrived at their destination, the duke invites Jehan to go with him to the castle. He replies that a year ago he had set a trap to catch a bird, and he now wishes to see whether he had caught him. The English laugh again and the duke adds:

Laissez vous pes, vienez vous fete
Gardez de le plus bel porcel
Dont puisse homme baisier mosel.
Demain la puës veoir bouser
A moi, se tu voeles aler. (2836-40)

The duke goes to the castle, where he relates to the Count of Oxford the good jokes which he had heard from the foolish Frenchman (3103-68). In the meantime Jehan meets Blonde at the appointed place, and together they escape to Dover, where a ship lies in waiting for them. They are pursued by the duke and his men, but Jehan performs miracles of bravery, and the duke is forced to give up the fight. His men counsel him to desist.

Ce sont debles et anemis
En combatre de par Francis.
Deble puissent vers aus aler!
Lesse vous vo pourcel pouser.
Vous trouvera pourcel plenté;
N'as plus vers ceste volenté. (4491-96)

And the duke accepts the advice:

Vous disa bien nai;
Mauvais sont, et que faire n'ai. (4497, 4498)

Jehan is allowed to bring Blonde in safety to France.

The dialect in these passages is not strictly an English brogue. In fact, it would be difficult to say, not perhaps what should be present, but what should be absent from such speech.

The authors make use of inaccuracies of all sorts, such as are common in the mouths of foreigners speaking a language incorrectly. These may affect the pronunciation or the morphology and syntax. The former can be reproduced but imperfectly without the aid of phonetics; the latter are not subject to definite rules. It is evident, however, that in the thirteenth century, as today, three main types of brogue seemed humorous to the Frenchman—that of the Provençal, the German, and the Englishman; a fact which is clearly brought out by the question of the Frenchman in the *fabliau*, l. 51: “Es-tu Auvergnaz ou Tiois?” Each of these brogues has distinct traits of its own, but careful observation is necessary to reproduce them. In the passages under consideration they are confused, and the language of these Englishmen contains traits that belong properly to the Auvergnat or the German.

The English elements, to be sure, predominate. We may note first the various methods employed of giving local coloring to the speech. There are names of English saints, as *saint Thomas of Canterbury* (*Fabliau*, *Renart*), *saint Colas* (*Renart*), or peculiar names, the idea evidently being that a foreigner will have patron saints of his own, as *saint Jursalen* (*Renart*), *saint Almon* and *saint Joban* (*Fabliau*), though one is tempted to see in the last name an imperfect manuscript reading for *saint Johan*.

We find, in the next place, a certain number of English words: *have* and *ave* (*Fabliau*, 19, 20), *godehelpe* (*Renart*, 2351), *goditoet* (*ibid.*, 2397). The last word I take to be the English “god it wit.” To be sure, we should regularly expect “god it wot,” as it is found in *Haveloc*, 2527 (“woth”), but the vowel *i* is found in the singular; cf. “god it wite” (*ibid.*, 517, etc.). Martin¹ suggests that it represents the Dutch *god weet*, but this leaves the syllable *it* unaccounted for. We have further *nai* (*Jehan et Blonde*, 2658, etc.; *Renart*, 2357), *de* (= “the”) in *par de foi* (= “by the faith”) (*Jehan et Blonde*, 2685), and *mi* (= “my”) in *mi pareil* (*Jehan et Blonde*, 3142), *mi seignor* (*Renart*, 2357), *mi companion* (*Fabliau*, 37). There may be added a few Anglo-

¹ *Loc. cit.*, Vol. III, Supplement, p. 19.

Norman forms, such as *busoing* (*Jehan et Blonde*, 3123), *deble* (*ibid.*, 2659); but this list is soon exhausted.

Local coloring is also added by the literature cited by the *jongleur* Renart, ll. 2389-93. He knows good Breton (i. e., English) lays, such as those of Merlin and Noton,¹ of Artus and Tristan, of the *chèvrefeuil*, of St. Brandan, and of Isent.

Turning to the pronunciation, several distinct English traits are evident. The most prominent is the inability of these individuals to pronounce the sound of *ü*, which is constantly written *ou* or *o*; cf. *foustes*, *fou*, *fout*, *lou*, *mousel*, *soué* in the *Fabliau*; *fot* constantly in *Renart*; and *fou*, *fout*, *mosel*, *mouser* in *Jehan et Blonde*. In the case of the preterit of *estre* this gives rise to *double entendre* in the *Roman de Renart*, but when the Duke of Gloucester pronounces *pucelle* as *pourcel*, it gives the author the opportunity to turn the laugh against him, when he invites Jehan to come with him and see him marry

le plus bel porcel
Dont puisse homme baisier mosel. (2838)

In one word, *triant* (*Fabliau*, 25), *ü* has become *i*, perhaps to cause association with *triant*, a variant of *traiant* = *téton*.

We may note, in the next place, confusion in regard to the presence or absence of final *e*. This well-known development of the pronunciation in England has determined the form of many a French word in English.² Our texts are not uniform in this regard. No examples in point are found in the *Fabliau*. In the *Roman de Renart* this *e* is constantly omitted; cf. *Bretaing*, *enseing*, *Engleter*, *quer*, *arier*, *lecher*, *Cantorbir*, *jogler*, and in *Jehan et Blonde* it is in addition very frequently written where it does not belong; cf. *besoing*, *cos*, *merveil* and *chere*, *sote*, *entere*, *fule*, *lasse*, *oiselete*, etc.

¹ Martin, *loc. cit.*, Vol. III, Supplement, p. 17, note, suggests that *Noton* is a corruption of *Goron*, so that the reference would be to the "Roman de Guiron le courtois." I rather think that *Noton* = *Neptunus*, and that the lay referred to related a story of a water-spirit uniting with a mortal, as told, for instance, in the "Lai de Tydorel," *Romania*, Vol. VIII, pp. 66 ff.; cf. also *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, Vol. XXIV, pp. 557 ff. This passage, it seems to me, has not been given sufficient weight in the well-known controversy concerning the introduction of Breton tradition into French literature.

² Cf. Suchier, *Ueber die dem Matthaeus Paris zugeschriebene Vie de Saint Auban* (Halle, 1876), pp. 36-39; and Stimming, *Der angelnormannische Boeve de Haumtone* (Halle, 1899), p. 181.

Of similar Anglo-Norman color is the loss of certain initial syllables (*a-*, *es-*, *en-*, *de-*, *re-*) which occurs in all three texts; cf. *Fabliau*: (*a*)*chatera*, 41; *chat* (*achate*), 58; (*a*)*chatai*, 85; (*a*)*porté*, 81; (*es*)*gardai*, 86; *Renart*: (*a*)*pris*, 2364; (*a*)*pelez*, 2420; (*a*)*lumer*, 2941; (*a*)*tendez*, 2978; *boucez* (*espousez*), 2927; (*en*)*gendrer*, 2942; (*de*)*moré*, 2966; (*re*)*sambler*, 2438; *Jehan et Blonde*: (*a*)*cater*, 2649; *complie* (*acompli*), 3156; (*a*)*corder*, 3370; (*a*)*pelé*, 2640; (*a*)*pris*, 3150; (*a*)*prochier*, 3125; *trapés* (*atrapez*), 3363; (*a*)*venu*, 3135; (*es*)*conser*, 3112; (*es*)*garder*, 2699; (*es*)*pervier*, 3158; (*es*)*pouser*, 3164; (*es*)*suier*, 3138; (*em*)*bati*, 3127; (*en*)*gané*, 3121; (*en*)*ganames*, 3146; (*en*)*tendre*, 2702.

One is tempted to see a broad English *a* in *malart* (= *malade*) (*Fabliau*, 57), and the characteristic English pronunciation of *r* + consonant is certainly present in the confusion of *pucelle* and *porcel*, already mentioned.

Confusion between palatal¹ *n* and dental *n* (*aignel* and *anel*) is the center of the jest of the *Fabliau*; note also *companion* (*ibid.*, 23). It is present also in *Jehan et Blonde*: *compainons*, 2679, *ganames*, 3146; *gané*, 3121. Similarly² *l'* becomes *l*; *Jehan et Blonde*: *melor*, 2698; *vol*, 2650; *voelle*, 2661.

The distinct English traits in this brogue are, however, soon exhausted. The confusion of voiced and voiceless labials, which occurs in the *Roman de Renart* and *Jehan et Blonde* is German; cf. *Renart*: *boucez*, 2932, *bosez*, 2950 (= *espousez*); *Jehan et Blonde*: *bouser*, 2839 (= *espouser*); *Renart*: *basse* (= *passe*), 2950; *fotre merci*, 2459, 2851 (= *votre merci*). In the word cited last there is the same obscene suggestion already mentioned. I am also inclined to attribute to German influence the *ya* (= *oui*) of *Renart*, 2394.

The speech of the Duke of Gloucester is characterized by a second person plural in *-a* or *-as*; cf. *Jehan et Blonde*: *avas*, 2697, 2702; *conta*, 2819; *disa*, 4497, 2779; *savas*, 3168; *seras*, 2832; *trouvera*, 4495; *verras*, 3164. This is explained, and no doubt correctly, by Suchier³ as a Provençal element. I remember hearing in Paris a dialect recitation representing the speech of an

¹ Cf. Stimming, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

² Cf. *ibid.*, p. 212.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 415.

Auvergnat, and the most striking feature of it was the ending -a of the verb without regard to its form. I am inclined to look upon certain other verb-forms in -a in this same text as having the same origin; cf. *ava* (= *avoie*), 3109, 3125, (= *avoit*), 3157; *disa* (= *disoie*), 3161, (= *disoit*), 3106, 3110, etc.; *faisa* (= *faisoit*), 3368; *fera* (= *feroit*), 3111, 3143; *ira* (= *iroit*), 3159; *ria* (= *rioit*), 3149; *sera* (= *seroit*), 3123, 3129, etc.; *vena* (= *venoit*), 3105, 3151; *vola* (= *voloie*), 3153, (= *voloit*), 2700, 3165, *volra* (= *voudroit*), 3118, 3143. The first person singular of the preterit and future in -a presents, however, more probably confusion with the third person singular; cf. *cevauc*, 3126; *fera*, 3362; *metra*, 3375; *sera*, 3374; and others. Suchier looks upon *plouvina* (third person singular preterit), 3107, as a word borrowed from the Provençal, but the references in Godefroy, s. v. *plover*, show that it is not at all improper in Old French.

We have now exhausted the phonetic elements of this dialect, that can be referred to the direct influence of the pronunciation of English or other languages. The remaining features represent inaccuracies affecting the morphology and the syntax.

Here one of the most striking traits is the confusion in the gender of nouns, the effect of which is very humorous. In *Jehan et Blonde* this confusion is not infrequently brought about by the improper addition of a mute *e*, as in *bone sote entere*, 2660; *oiselete*, 2835; or by its absence, as in *le rivier*, 3132; *un rivier*, 3127; but in general the error is more direct cf. *Fabliau*: *bones deniers*, 42; *si faite mousel*, 99; *si fait pel*, 100; *Renart*: *ton reson*, 2352; *ma compaing*, 2359; *mon viel*, 2372; *bon chancon*, 2801; *un candoil en ton mein* 2939; *la martir*, 2974; *Jehan et Blonde*: *mon meson*, 2701; *mon cote*, 3109; *son volenté*, 3119; *bon feste*, 3147; *un bon sotie*, 3155.

Of the same type are the inaccuracies in the conjugation. All verbs tend toward the first conjugation; *Fabliau*: *querer*, 29; *Renart*: *saver*, 2352; *perdez* (= *perdu*), 2358; *diser*, 2374; *voler*, 2810; *giser*, 2956; *faser* (= *faire*), 2937; *devener*, 2969; *Jehan et Blonde*: *dolé*, 3134; *vené*, 2639, past participles of *douloir* and *venir* respectively; *voelle*, first person singular, *voeles*, second person singular present indicative of *vouloir*. In one instance—

prende, 2651—there is an indefinite verb-form used as an infinitive.

In the case of the finite verb there is to be noted great confusion in the use of the persons. The third person singular stands for the first or second person; *Renart*: *pot*, 2463; *foi*, 2462, constantly (*foi*=second person singular, 2466); *Jehan et Blonde*: cf. the similar confusion of *ai* and *a* in the future and preterit, already noted. In other instances one verb or tense is used for another; *Jehan et Blonde*: *avra* (= *j'ai*), 3150; *ava* (= *avoie*), 3130; *sara* (= *je sais*), 3167; *sera* (= *avoit*), 3142, (= *étoit*), 3123, 3129, 3135; *seras* (= *êtes*), 2832; *puisse* (= *peut*), 2834; *puisse* (= *pouvez*), 2817; *fui* (= *suis*), 3139, (= *fut*), 3160; *viene* (= *venez*), 2818, 2836, 3163. From these examples it is seen that *avoir* and *être* are confused as auxiliaries. This is particularly true of the *Fabliau* and *Roman de Renart*, where *foi* or *fout* is practically the only auxiliary in existence. In *Jehan et Blonde* the two verbs are used more accurately, but the tense, or person, is confused; *Fabliau*: *mi fout Anglois*, 52; *mi companion fout malart*, 57; *Renart*: *moi foi perdez*, 2358; *ge foi pris* (= *j'ai appris*), 2802; *vos foi oré* (= *vous avez oré*), 2965; *Jehan et Blonde*: *ce fu non sot*, 2643; *cil varlet fou il vostre gent*, 2645; *il fout mout bel*, 2651; *s'il sera pris* (= *s'il est pris*), 3159; *pour çou k'il me sera venu* (= *pour çou ki m'étoit venu*), 3135, etc.

Hand in hand with this confusion in the morphology of the language goes a general relaxation of the rules of syntax. The subject pronoun of the first person is apt to appear in its accusative form; *Fabliau*: *mi' fout Anglois*, 52; *mi porra bien mengier*, 27; *mi vos ira moustrer*, 92. Very frequently a quasi-compound tense will then be made with the auxiliary *foi* and the infinitive, the subject being sometimes correct, sometimes *moi*, or again absent altogether; *Renart*: *moi foi aver non*, 2380; *je foi rober* (= *je fus robé*), 2371; *je foi servir* (= *je servirois*), 2387; *ge foi savoir* (= *je sais*), 2389; *foi moi diser* (= *je dirai*), 2464; *bien foi sembler* (= *il semble bien*), 2808; *por toi qui foi sembler prodrom* (= *qui sembles*), 2466. Many similar examples might

¹ One is tempted to look upon *mi* as Anglo-Norman; cf. Visling, *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, Vol. V, p. 68. However, this form is much more frequent in certain continental dialects, and should probably be referred to them.

be cited from the *Roman de Renart*, while in *Jehan et Blonde* the complexion of the syntax is in general better preserved, though cf. *je li fis respondu* (= *je lui ai respondu*), 3120; *par de foi qu'il doit tous Franchis* (= *par la foi que doit tout François*), 2685; see also 3135 and 3145. But here it is impossible and unprofitable to indicate all the licenses taken with the language, which are particularly frequent in the *Roman de Renart*; cf. 2363, 2365, 2366, 2368, 2434, 2809, 2810, 2973.

Finally, it is of interest to point out certain plays on words having a humorous effect; *Fabliau*: *triant*, 25, has already been commented upon; *malart* (*mi companon fout moult malart*) = *malade*, 57, is the name of a duck; *Renart*: *France* (= *français*), 2364; the two words *char* and *chief* are confused, 2855; and a song of *Olivant et Rollier* is cited 2854; *Jehan et Blonde*: there is confusion between *bretesce* and *boresce*, *cors* and *col*, *pecheor* and *pescheor*, *porcel* and *pucelle*, *reveler* and *relever*; *gent*, 2645, has the meaning of *man*, *Franchis* means *François*, and the archaic *Francor* appears, 3140.

The two political documents of this same period cited above do not differ seriously from those just studied as far as their language is concerned, and this simple reference will suffice our purpose.

As already stated, my list includes no similar composition of the fourteenth century. The remaining example to be cited occurs in the *Mystère de Paris*, preserved in a manuscript of the year 1472. Here the king of England and his knights speak a broken French, cf. *ed. cit.*, pp. 55-74. The quantity of outright errors is here increased to such a degree that the general effect of the picture is much less pleasing and artistic, but from the following enumeration it will appear that the method of constructing the brogue has not changed.

Local coloring is given by the constant appeal to *St. Gorg*. In the thirteenth century the saint's name of most decided English color was that of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Though officially recognized as the patron saint of England since the year 1222, evidently the acceptance of the name of "St. George" among the masses was gradual. The name occurs three times in the

Roman de Renart, but is not used by the fox while he impersonates the English *jongleur*. The English king and his knights constantly swear *bigot*, and address each other as *milort* or *millort*; they affirm *by me fuy*, 58, and *bi me trot*, 66, and say *adiou*, 70, on leaving. We note the following additional English words: *het* (= "head"), 58; *hect* (= "head"), 66; *hardely*, 57, 59; *yé* (= "yea"), 59; *meny*, 56; *faroual* (= "farewell"), 63. Others may have escaped my notice. A very interesting passage occurs on p. 56, intended to represent English directly. The lines appear to consist of a mere jumble of letters without meaning, though the king of England to whom they are addressed replies *Bigot! j'entendy bien cela*; yet a few not very complimentary words, such as *hourson* (which occurs also p. 69), and *dog* are evident. Others I may have failed to understand.

The phonetic traits are partly those familiar from the earlier portion of this study. (1) The final *e* is absent where it should appear; *arm*, *mer* (= *mère*), *guis*, *batail*, *dac* (= *daguer*), *banier*, *vach*, *pag*, *Frans* (= *France*), *lans* (= *lance*), *dyt* (= *dites*), *vot* (= *votre*), etc. (2) Accented syllables disappear: *pas* (= *passer*), *frap* (= *frapper*). (3) Initial syllables fall: *pelé* (= *appelé*), *semblé* (= *assemblé*), *Gleter* (= *Angleterre*), *presté* (= *appresté*), *trape* (= *attrape*), *sommy* (= *assomé*), *tent* (= *entends*). (4) *r* before consonant is silent: *palé* (= *parlé*), *paillarde* rimes with *salade*, 57. (5) *l'* and *n'* have become *l* and *n*: *Vuilam* (= *Guillaume*), *compenon*.

Others are new. (1) *y* or *i* stands for final *é*, which evidently represents the English pronunciation of closed *e*: *army* (= *armer*), *ally* (= *allez*), *scavery* (= *saurai*), *copy* (= *couper*), *asommy* (= *assomer*), *crii* (= *crier*), *porty* (= *porter*), *donny* (= *donner*), *tuy* (= *tuer*), *j'aury* (= *j'aurai*), *embly* (= *emblem*), *pily* (= *pillier*), *logy* (= *logé*), *clochy* (= *clocher*), etc. (2) *ien* becomes *in*: *bin*, *vin* (= *viens*), *bintot*. (3) *v* becomes *w*: *wacarm* (= *vacarme*).

For the morphology we may note (1) a general verb-ending in *y* or *é* which serves all the demands of the sentence: *futy* (= *soit, sont*), *fouty* (= *je serai*), *faity* (= *je fais*), *sy se trouvy* (= *s'il se trouvait*), *ally* (= *allons, aille*), *alé* (= *allez, je vais*),

dity (= *dites*), *ameny* (= *amener*), *fré* (= *ferons*), *veny* (= *vien-nent* or *vient*), *parly* (= *parlez*), *j'entendy* (*j'entends*), *pende* (= *pendre*), etc.; this feature is constant. (2) The preterit of *être* serves as general auxiliary: *que je fut army* (= *que je sois armé*), 56; *futy* (= *vous êtes*), 56, *fut sommy* (= *sont assommés*), 70; *que tout futy pelé* (= *que tout soit appelé*), 57, etc. (3) A constant confusion of gender: *arm de mon mer* (= *armes de ma mère*), 55; *tout mon gent*, 56; *mon grant lans* (= *ma grande lance*), 56; *de bon larm* (= *de bonnes armes*), 57; *la bon lom* (= *les bons hommes*), 57; *la milort ma cousin*, 59; *la grant Saint Gorg*, 59; *Dieu gart la cont, aussy son fam*, 66; *sa col* (= *son cou*), 66; *la mondam de mer* (= *madame ma mère*), 66.

Errors in syntax are constant in every line. (1) The infinitive stands for a finite verb: *moi alé a pilag*, 57; *moy voult parté* (= *je veux partir*), 60; *moi non reentry jamais*, 74, etc. (2) The article is erroneously used: *l'army de bon l'arm* (= *armé de bonnes armes*), 57; *qui fut bon larcher*, 57; *par ton lam* (= *par ton âme*), 57; *futy vous bien larmé* (= *êtes-vous bien armé*), 56; *vaillant lom*, 59, etc.

There are many other particular errors that might be cited, some of which give a rather humorous turn to the language of these Englishmen speaking French. But enough has been brought out to show that the brogue attributed to Englishmen in Old French literature is to a certain extent made up of various sources, that some are the result of exact observation of the pronunciation, and that the greater part of the humor comes from morphological and syntactical errors which do not belong solely to the French of Marlborough or the school of Stratford atte Bowe.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY.

AHASVER IN DER KUNSTDICHTUNG

Kaum ein zweiter Stoff hat vermöge des in ihm schlummern- den Reichtums an moralphilosophischen sowohl als romantisch- phantastischen, daneben auch an wahrhaft poetischen Motiven die neuere Dichtung so lebhaft beschäftigt wie die Sage vom ewigen Juden. Erst gegen Ende des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts griffen die Literaten die treuherzige Erzählung von dem zum Ewig- lebenmüssen verdamnten Beleidiger des Heilands auf, die bereits in der ersten Hälfte des dreizehnten ihre halbttausendjährige Wan- derung durch die Niederungen des volksmässigen Schrifttums angetreten hatte und, durch Chronisten zuerst aufgezeichnet, seit Beginn des sechzehnten durch Volksbücher und Flugblätter weithin verbreitet worden war. Mit grosser Schnelligkeit bür- gerte sich nunmehr der verschiedentlich als Cartaphilus, Dudu- laeus, Buttadeus, Laquedem, in Deutschland gemeinhin als Ahasverus bekannte Held der Sage in der Kunstdichtung ein. Fast gleichzeitig tritt er in der Lyrik und Epik, nicht gar viel später in der Dramatik auf, und beweist, bald als Haupt-, bald als Nebenperson, in zahllosen Erzeugnissen deutscher, franzö- sischer, englischer Schriftsteller eine beispieldlose Umgestalt- barkeit.

Übereinstimmend bemühen sich alle ernst zu nehmenden Be- arbeiter des Stoffes, der farblos überlieferten verhängnisvollen Freveltat eine psychologische Erklärung unterzulegen. Bahn- weisend wird hierin Goethe, wenn er dem unseligen Schuster eine wohlwollende Gesinnung gegen den Heiland imputiert¹ und seine Veründigung sowie die seines Gefährten Judas Ischariot als eine heillose Folge irregeleiteten Patriotismus auffasst.² Auch fehlt es nicht an Dichtern, die für Ahasver als einen unschuldigen Dulder oder doch einen weit über das Mass seiner Verfehlung

¹ S. *Goethes Werke*, Hempelsche Ausg., Bd. XXII, pp. 179, 180 und *passim* (s. Register daselbst); *ibid.*, Bd. XXIV, p. 112.

² Allerdings denken in Goethes unausgeführtem Schema diese beiden sehr verschieden über Christus. Spätere Bearbeiter übertragen den Fanatismus des Goetheschen Judas auf Ahasver.

hinaus gestraften Sänder Partei ergreifen,¹ ja, in echter Sturm- und Drangstimmung sich mit dessen ungebrochenem Trotze gegen den göttlichen Despotismus identifizieren. Andererseits macht sich der Wunsch geltend, auch den Urteilsspruch des Heilands ethisch zu begründen, das über Ahasver verhängte Strafgericht mit dem christlichen Glauben an des Gottsohns unbegrenzte Güte und Barmherzigkeit in Einklang zu bringen, und dies fromme Bemühen führt mit logischer Konsequenz zur Postulierung einer höheren erzieherischen Absicht, die in der gewollten und durch den Fluch bereits eingeleiteten Bekehrung Ahasvers besteht. Im Zusammenhang hiermit steht wohl auch die allmähliche Milderung oder Beseitigung der dem Stoffe anhaftenden Cruditäten, die Verinnerlichung des tragischen Leides, die endliche Erlösung Ahasvers.

Dass die individuelle Auffassung der Sage im allgemeinen oder in besonderen Zügen stark unter dem Einfluss der die Zeit jeweilig beherrschenden Weltanschauungen steht, bedarf keines nachdrücklichen Hinweises.² Ohne, trotz der erwähnten Bemühungen, gleich seinem Sagenvetter Faust eine endgültige litterarische Gestaltung erfahren zu haben, hat doch der ewige Jude die Phantasie manch eines wirklich bedeutenden Dichters in Erregung versetzt. Und es muss deshalb wundernehmen, dass die Forschung die immerhin verlockende Aufgabe,³ die Entwicklungsgeschichte des fesselnden Stoffes in der modernen Literatur eingehend zu verfolgen, noch nicht ernstlich in Angriff genommen hat.

Was die sagengeschichtliche Behandlung des Gegenstands

¹ Wie schon Ch. F. D. Schubart. Sein Gedicht erschien zuerst im *Schwäbischen Musenalmanach* für 1784; dort pp. 173 f.: der ewige Jud. Während jedoch Schubart die Tendenz am Schlusse in religiösem Sinne umbiegt, trägt bei seinem Nachfolger Shelley der ewige Jude, so oft er in den reifen Werken des grossen englischen Lyrikers auftaucht, die Stürmer- und Drängernatur unverhohlen zur Schau. S. unten p. 6, Anmkg. 3.

² So sei z. B. unter neueren Versionen das Epos *Jehovah* von Carmen Sylva (Leipzig, 1882) erwähnt, worin mit glühender Überzeugung der evolutionistische Glaube vorgetragen wird. Ja, bei Johanna und Gustav Wolff sowie bei dem tschechischen Dichter Machar tritt Ahasver geradezu als Apostel des Lebens auf (s. den unten zitierten Aufsatz von Rudolf Fürst, Spalte 1546. Mir selbst blieben die beiden letztgenannten Dichtungen unzugänglich.) Eine krass antichristliche Tendenz — Ahasver will nicht sterben, bis Christus wiederkommt, um dann ihn zu entlarven — atmet u. a. das anonyme Gedicht *Ahasver, ein Monolog von Ego*. (Zürich, 1890).

³ Die ihr schon H. Mielke, *Der deutsche Roman des 19. Jahrhunderts*, p. 19, ans Herz legt.

betrifft, so ist der Mythos vom ewigen Juden bereits recht eingehend untersucht,¹ wiewohl, entgegen der allgemeinen Annahme, keineswegs erschöpfend. Aus dem zuletzt angeführten Grunde nehme ich hier Gelegenheit, auf ein merkwürdiges Analogon aufmerksam zu machen, das allerdings bereits im Jahre 1844 der Forschung erschlossen wurde,² jedoch gänzlich unbeachtet blieb, und auf das neuerdings ein japanischer Gelehrter hingewiesen hat.³ Sollte nun in der Tat die der chinesischen Sam-yuktägama-Sûtra und der sanskritischen Divijâvâna zufolge von Buddha über seinen Jünger Pindola Bharadvâja wegen verbotenen Wunderwirkens verhängte Strafe mit der Sage vom ewigen Juden im Zusammenhang stehen, so wäre die erste Aufzeichnung der Sage um nicht weniger als achthundert Jahre hinter den bisher angesetzten Terminus zurückzudatieren. Auch würde in dem Falle bis auf weiteres die Theorie vom ekklesiastischen Ursprung des Ahasver-Mythos unhaltbar.⁴

Indessen, ist auf diesen wichtigen mythographischen Punkt hier nicht näher einzugehen. Die nachstehenden Ausführungen beschränken sich vielmehr darauf, den gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung über die Ahasvertypen der neueren Literatur

¹ In neuerer Zeit zuerst von I. G. Th. Graesse, *Die Sage vom ewigen Juden* (Dresden, 1844) und von demselben Verfasser, *Der Tannhäuser und der ewige Jude* (Dresden, 1861); sodann von Charles Schoebel, *La légende du Juif-Errant* (Paris, 1877); viel wissenschaftlicher von Gaston Paris, *Le Juif-Errant* (Extrait de l'Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses; Paris, 1880); erwähnenswert ist Abbé Crampon, "Le Juif Errant," *Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences etc. d'Amiens*, Bd. L; am gründlichsten L. Neubaur, *Die Sage vom ewigen Juden* (Leipzig, 1884; 2. verm. Ausg., 1893).

² Durch E. Burnouf, *Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme indien* (2. Ausg., 1876), p. 335; zitiert nach A. J. Edmunds (s. unten).

³ Kumagusu Minakata, in *Notes and Queries* (London, 1899), pp. 121-24; den Nachweis verdanke ich einem Aufsatz von Albert J. Edmunds in *The Open Court*, Bd. XVII (1903), No. 12, pp. 755, 756 ("The Wandering Jew, a Buddhist Parallel"). Doch hatte der oben genannte Japaner schon mehrere Jahre vorher in *Nature*, Bd. LIII (1895), p. 78, eine Parallele zwischen der Sage vom ewigen Juden und einer indischen Legende aufgestellt.

⁴ Sonderbarerweise ist übrigens Herrn Edmunds eine etwas spätere Mitteilung des selben Gewährsmanns im gleichen Jahrgang der *Notes and Queries*, p. 166, entgangen. Dort zitiert Minakata nach dem Poh-wuh-chi des Chinesen Chang Hwa (232-300 A. D.) eine weitere Sage, die seines Erachtens in noch engerer Beziehung zur Ahasver-Sage steht als die von Pindola, weil der vom Tode Übergangene — er heisst Pan-Yu-Ming — ein Jahrhundert nach dem Tode seines Herrschers in dessen Grabe lebendig aufgefunden wird und seit dieser Zeit rastlos wandern muss. Der im Grabe fortlebende Ahasver begegnet, nebenbei bemerkt, auch öfters in der modernen Dichtung, so namentlich bei I. Ch. Freiherrn v. Zedlitz, "Die Wanderungen des Ahasvers" (*Gedichte*, Stuttgart, 1859, pp. 495-545). Ist Pan-Yu-Ming das Urbild Ahasvers, so wäre die Entstehung der Sage vom ewigen Juden gar um mindestens tausend Jahre weiter hinaufzurücken.

einigermassen zu beleuchten.¹ An Schriften über diesen Gegenstand ist fürwahr kein Mangel; nur ist darunter leider keine einzige von wirklichem kritischen Werte. Gleichwohl kämen für eine etwaige umfassende wissenschaftliche Behandlung des Themas die folgenden drei Vorarbeiten in Betracht:

1. F. Helbig, *Die Sage vom ewigen Juden, ihre poetische Wandlung und Fortbildung*;² ein Buch, das wenig mehr als geschickte Inhaltsangaben bietet, einen grossen Teil des Materials übergeht und an der Schwelle einer für unser Thema äusserst fruchtbaren Produktionsperiode Halt macht.

2. Moncure D. Conway, *The Wandering Jew*;³ ein umfangreiches Werk, hinsichtlich der englischen Ahasverliteratur recht belehrend, hinsichtlich der deutschen unkritisch und zum Teil unselbständig.

3. Rudolf Fürst, *Ahasver-Dichtungen*;⁴ viel knapper und gehaltvoller als die vorgenannten, lässt aber in Bezug auf Vollständigkeit viel, auf rationelle Anordnung und Verwertung des Materials das meiste zu wünschen übrig. Der Verfasser, der seltsamerweise von Helbig überhaupt nicht zu wissen scheint während ihm die ziemlich verbreitete Conway'sche Schrift "unzugänglich" blieb, unterzieht im ganzen dreiunddreissig Dichtungen einer gelegentlich feinen, überall klaren, doch nirgends in den Gegenstand vertieften Besprechung. Elf weitere Bearbeitungen werden von ihm bloss titelweise angeführt. Meines Wissens bezeichnet die eben erwähnte, mit den Mängeln einer Zwitterform von Feuilleton und wissenschaftlicher Abhandlung behaftete Arbeit dennoch den ungefähren Höhepunkt der literaturhistorischen Produktion auf dem in Frage stehenden Gebiete.⁵ Einzig aus diesem Grunde wird sie im folgenden so stark herangezogen.

¹ Sie sollen gewissermassen dazu dienen, die vorhandene Literatur über Ahasver in der Kunstdichtung zu ergänzen. Mithin glaubte der Verfasser die ziemlich allgemein bekannten und übereinstimmend beurteilten Ahasverdichtungen von Lenau, Hamerling, Quinet, Grenier, Béranger, Andersen u. a. unerwähnt lassen zu dürfen. Auch eine Reihe der von Rudolf Fürst (s. unten) verzeichneten Fassungen geringeren Wertes (z. B. die von F. Horn) brauchte aus dem angeführten Grunde nicht genannt zu werden.

² Berlin, 1874.

³ New York und London, 1881.

⁴ *Literarisches Echo*, VI. Jhgg., 21. u. 22. Heft, Spalte 1467-77, u. 1539-49.

⁵ Von Spezialarbeiten wie e. g. J. Minor, *Goethe's Fragmente vom ewigen Juden und vom wiederkehrenden Heiland* (Stuttgart, 1904) ist natürlich hier nicht die Rede.

Dass einem so wohlgeschulten und fleissigen Nachforscher wie Fürst eine stattliche Reihe bedeutsamer Erscheinungen der Ahasverliteratur entgehen konnte, deutet zur Genüge an, wie misslich es mit der Bibliographie derselben bestellt ist. Zwar gibt Neubaur¹ ein erschöpfendes Verzeichnis der Volksbücher und sonstiger frühen Drucke. So weit hingegen die kunstliterarischen Fassungen in Frage kommen, lassen die üblichen Hilfsmittel, sogar Goedeke² nicht ausgenommen, den Sammler so ziemlich im Stich.³

Es ist somit kein Wunder, wenn es Fürst nicht viel besser gelang als seinen Vorgängern, von der Zahl und Verschiedenheit der Variationen über unser Thema einen entsprechenden Begriff zu geben.

Im Nachfolgenden seien mehrere falsche, auch in Fachkreisen verbreitete und neuerdings von Fürst abermals vertretene Ansichten bezüglich dieser Literatur in Kürze berichtigt.⁴

Am vielwendigsten bewahrt sich Ahasver keineswegs, wie von Fürst nachdrücklich versichert wird, in Frankreich, sondern in erster Reihe in Deutschland, sodann in England. Der Reichtum und die Bedeutung der englischen Ahasverdichtung werden leider in Deutschland nicht nach Gebühr gewürdigt. So erwähnt denn Fürst ausser der Ballade bei Percy,⁵ die schwerlich ohne weiteres in die Kunstdichtung einzureihen ist, und dem verschollenen Zweiakter von Andrew Franklin,⁶ der eigentlich nur weitläufig in diesen Zusammenhang gehört,⁷ nur einen amerikanischen Schauer-

¹ *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Bd. X., pp. 249-67 u. ebenda pp. 297-316.

² *Grundriss*, Bd. II, pp. 569-70, und ebenda Bd. IV, p. 645.

³ K. Engel, *Zusammenstellung der Faustschriften*, etc. (Oldenburg, 1885), pp. 618 f., kennt nur 34 wirklich hierher gehörige Schriften.

⁴ Fürsts bibliographische Angaben sind nicht überall zuverlässig, weshalb bei den meisten der unten besprochenen Bücher der genaue Titel nebst Ort und Jahr vermerkt ist.

⁵ *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765; ed. Edw. Walford, London, o. J. [1880]). S. pp. 253, 254: "The Wandering Jew." Diese Ballade war schon in der Pepys'schen Sammlung (1700) enthalten.

⁶ *The Wandering Jew or Love's Masquerade* (London, 1797).

⁷ Der Held tritt als ewiger Jude verkleidet auf. Ähnlich wird die Rolle Ahasvers in scherzhafter Weise zur Täuschung leichtgläubiger Landleute simuliert von der Hauptperson des Romans *Mon Oncle Benjamin* von Claude Tillier (1801-44) (Paris, o. J.), pp. 79 ff.

roman¹ und dessen englisches Muster.² Und doch dürfen Shelley,³ Southey,⁴ Wordsworth⁵ zu den Ahasverdichtern gezählt werden. Dass immerhin beachtenswerte Leistungen wie das Epos der Lady Maxwell⁶ unerwähnt bleiben, mag noch hingehen. Dagegen ist es recht sonderbar, dass die Dichtungen der beiden Schotten W. E. Aytoun⁷ und Robert Buchanan,⁸ wiewohl sie zu den grosszügigsten und formvollendetsten gehören, die der Stoff überhaupt gezeitigt hat, der Forschung nicht minder fremd geblieben sind als der deutschen Lesewelt.

Unhaltbar ist ferner die oft aufgestellte, auch von dem neuesten Forscher wiederholte Behauptung, die ehrwürdige Gestalt des ewigen Juden trete nur selten in der Verzerrung auf. Die Anfänge der satirischen Verwendung Ahasvers liegen recht weit zurück.⁹ Von Tillier's *Mon Oncle Benjamin* war bereits oben die Rede. Klassisch in ihrer Art ist die köstliche, noch heute geniessbare Travestie von Eugène Sue's vielgelesenem Machwerk,¹⁰ verfasst von Ch. Philipon und Louis Huart.¹¹ Über

¹ Lew Wallace, *The Prince of India*, 2 Bde. (New York, 1893).

² Rev. Geo. Croley, *Salathiel: A Story of the Past, the Present, and the Future*, 3 Bde (London, 1823 f.).

³ Mit seinem Vetter Medwin zusammen (7) schrieb er schon in seiner Schulzeit eine Ahasver-Erzählung, die kurz darauf in gemeinschaftlicher Arbeit zu einem Epos umgestaltet wurde (1809-10). Dies Jugendwerk steht unzweifelhaft im Zeichen des bekannten Gedichtes von Ch. D. F. Schubart. S. *The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (Boston and New York), Bd. IV, pp. 346-90; "The Wandering Jew." Die Spuren Ahasvers durchziehen übrigens, in dem weiter oben (p. 2, und *ibid.* Anmkg. 1) erwähnten Sinne, Shelley's Dichtung bis an sein Lebensende.

⁴ *Poems by Robert Southey. Chosen and Arranged by Edward Dowden* (London: Macmillan, 1895), pp. 115-35: "The Curse of Kehama" (begonnen 1801, vollendet 1809). Zwar keine Ahasver-Dichtung im eigentlichsten Sinne, jedoch von unserer Sage ausgegangen und im Geiste mit ihr identisch.

⁵ *Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, edited by John Morley (London, o. J.); p. 151: "Song for the Wandering Jew" (geschrieben 1800).

⁶ The Hon. Mrs. Norton (Caroline Elizabeth Sarah Norton), *The Undying One* (London, 2. Aufl., 1830).

⁷ Theodore Martin, *Memoir of W. E. Aytoun* (Edinburgh and London, o. J. [1867 f]); pp. 50-56: "The Wandering Jew" (geschrieben um 1834).

⁸ *The Wandering Jew: A Christmas Carol* (London, 1893).

⁹ S. *Goethes Werke*, Hempelsche Ausg., Bd. III, pp. 181-89: "Des ewigen Juden erster Fetzen" (geschrieben e. 1769-75, nach Strehlke grösstenteils 1774; gedruckt erst 1836); hierzu s. auch unten, p. 7, Anmkg. 4. Satirisch ist aber die Gestalt Ahasvers selbst vielleicht zuerst (wenigstens in Deutschland) bei Achim v. Arnim, *Halle und Jerusalem: Studentenspiel und Pilgerabenteuer* (Heidelberg, 1811); *Werke* (Berlin, 1846), Bd. XVI.

¹⁰ *Le Juif Errant* (Paris, 1845).

¹¹ *Parodie du Juif Errant* (Bruxelles, 1845).

die zeitsatirische Benutzung der Ahasvergestalt bei W. Hauff in den *Mitteilungen aus den Memoiren des Satans* vgl. Fürst, Spalte 1474, 1475.

Vollends in der Gegenwart begegnen wir dem heitern und komischen Ahasver an zahlreichen Stellen. Aus der langen Galerie modernisierter ewiger Juden verdienen wegen ihres besonderen literarischen Interesses zwei amerikanische Schöpfungen hervorgehoben zu werden.¹ Auch in der modernen deutschen Literatur tauchen zahlreiche Karikaturen des ewigen Juden auf.² Natürlich haben sich die Witzblätter die groteske Figur nicht entgehen lassen.³ Mit feinsinnigem Humor hat sie Rudolf Baumbach in seiner reizenden Ballade⁴ behandelt. Wer den ewigen Juden auf seinen Wanderungen durch die neuere deutsche Literatur zu begleiten wünscht, der darf vor öden Strecken und dünnen Gegenden nicht zurückscheuen. Die Fassungen von Eduard Duller, Bernhard Giseke, Alex. Graf von Württemberg, F. Theremin, Christian Kuffner, Gustav Pfizer, L. Köhler, Leop. Schefer, Theodor Oelckers, Joh. Gabriel Seidl, Hermann Lingg u. a. bilden freilich auch für den mutigen Forscher keine besonders dankenswerte Lektüre. Hoch über ihnen allen ragt das einsam grosse Ahasvergedicht des unverdient in Vergessenheit geratenen schwabischen Dichters Joh. Georg Fischer.⁵

Nicht ohne Wichtigkeit sind die von Fürst gleichfalls überangenen holländischen Bearbeitungen von J. J. L. Ten

¹ F. R. Stockton, *The Vizier of the Two-Horned Alexander* (New York: The Century Co., 1899; vorher in *The Century Magazine*, Bd. LVII u. LVIII seriatim) und F. Marion Crawford, *A Roman Singer* (New York, 1883). Von minderwertigen amerikanischen Ahasver-Produkten kenne ich etwa ein Dutzend.

² Z. B. Aug. Silberstein, *Der verwandelte Ahasver: Glas- und Raumbilder im St. Peterskeller zu Salzburg* (Leipzig, o. J. [1899]); Carry Brachvogel, *Die Wiedererstandenen: Cäsarenlegenden* (Berlin, 1900), pp. 90-134: "Götter a. D." Hierher gehört gleichfalls die anonyme Parodie *Der ewige Jude in Monte Carlo: ein Wintermärchen von der Riviera* (Dresden und Leipzig, 1892).

³ S. z. B. *Unsere Gesellschaft*, 8. Jhrg., Nr. 32, pp. 316, 317: "Ahasver" (mit 2 Illustr.) u. *Der Scherer*, 3. Jhrg., Nr. 1, pp. 4, 5: "Ins neue Land," Dichtung von Anton Renk.

⁴ R. Baumbach, *Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen* (Leipzig, 1878), pp. 9-11: "Ahasver." Schon Goethe plante, Ahasvers Schusterhandwerk humorvoll auszunützen: "Ich hatte ihn mit eines Handwerksgegnossen, mit Hans Sachsens Geist und Humor bestens ausgestattet." — *Goethe's Werke*, Hempelsche Ausg., Bd. XXII, p. 179. — Carry Brachvogels Sam A. Hasveros (S. oben Anmkg. 2) ist ein reicher Schuh-Grosshändler.

⁵ *Gedichte* (Stuttgart, 1854, 2. Aufl. 1858), pp. 188-190: "Der ewige Jude;" den Nachweis verdanke ich Herrn Prof. Dr. Jas. T. Hatfield in Evanston, Ill.]

Kate¹ und C. van Nievelt,² die russische, auch ins Deutsche übersetzte, des Schillerenthusiasten W. A. Shukoffsky³ und die dänische von B. S. Ingemann.

Schliesslich vermag ich auch der Ansicht, dass es der Dichtung der letzten Jahre vorbehalten geblieben, dem bleichen Schatten Ahasvers neues Leben einzuhauchen,⁴ nicht gänzlich beizutreten. Die Vermutung ist wohl richtig, dass die entscheidende Anregung von Adolf Wilbrandts *Meister von Palmyra* (1889) ausging; an dieses ihr mutmassliches Muster reichen die Ahasverdichtungen von Josef Seeber,⁵ Johannes Lepsius,⁶ Johanna u. Gustav Wolff,⁷ Wolfgang Madjera,⁸ Fritz Lienhard,⁹ Gustav Renner¹⁰ nicht heran.

Auf einer höheren künstlerischen Stufe als die vorgenannten stehen, wiewohl zum Teil älteren Ursprungs, die Dichtungen von Hans Herrig,¹¹ Adolf H. Povinelli,¹² Max Haushofer,¹³ Willi Soendermann¹⁴ und Maurice Reinhold von Stern.¹⁵

Als Nebenfigur ist Ahasver in neuerer Zeit in eindrucksvoller Weise in Werken von Eduard Grisebach,¹⁶ Prinz Emil von Schönaich-Carolath,¹⁷ u. a. angebracht werden.

¹ *Dramatische Poesy* (Leiden, o. J.), pp. 246-86: "Ahasverus op den Grimsel;" pp. 286-300: "De Wandelende Jood tot Rust gekomen."

² *Ahasverus: Nieuwe Phantasien* (Leiden, 1884), pp. 1-47: "Baron von Goldstetten."

³ *Ahasver, der ewige Jude*: Aus dem Russischen übersetzt. (Oppeln, 2. Aufl., 1884). Der Dichter starb im Jahre 1832. Ahasver war seine letzte Dichtung.

⁴ Fürst, *loc. cit.*, Spalte 1544.

⁵ *Der ewige Jude: Episches Gedicht* (Freiburg i. B., o. J. [1894]).

⁶ *Ahasver, der ewige Jude: Mysterium* (Leipzig, 1894).

⁷ *Ahasver* (Berlin, 1899); über dieses Buch kann ich allerdings nicht aus eigener Kenntnis sprechen.

⁸ *Ahasver: eine Tragödie* (Wien, 1903).

⁹ *Ahasver: Tragödie* (Stuttgart, 1903; zitiert nach Fürst).

¹⁰ *Ahasver: eine Dichtung* (Leipzig, 1902). ¹¹ *Jerusalem: Drama* (2. Ausg., Berlin, 1884).

¹² *Ahasverus in Tyrol: epische Dichtung aus disterer Zeit* (Leipzig, 1890).

¹³ *Der ewige Jude: ein dramatisches Gedicht in drei Teilen* (Leipzig, 1886).

¹⁴ *Ahasver, der ewige Jude: Tragödie in 5 Akten* (Dresden u. Leipzig, 1902).

¹⁵ *Die Insel Ahasvers: ein episches Gedicht* (Dresden u. Leipzig, 1893).

Die vorgenannten fünf Dichtungen fehlen bei Fürst; ebenso eine ganze Reihe weniger gelungener Versionen, wie z. B. Karl Esselborn, *Ahasver: Epos* (Leipzig, 1890).

¹⁶ *Der neue Tannhäuser* (Stuttgart, 1899), pp. 124-57: "Faust und der ewige Jude."

¹⁷ *Dichtungen* (Leipzig, o. J. [1883]), pp. 106-32: "Don Juans Tod."

OTTO HELLER.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
St. Louis, Mo.

SOME PRINCIPLES OF ELIZABETHAN STAGING¹

PART II

Besides the objections against accepting alternation as the universal method of Elizabethan staging, there is another consideration which, though not absolutely excluding the possibility of alternation, suggests the existence of an entirely different practice.

Some plays, no matter how thoroughly proved alternation might be, could not be explained by it. Specific scenes from them have already been alluded to, but it is as complete plays that they present difficulties not easily to be solved. They illustrate a dramatic convention long since disused; never, indeed, fully recognized by modern students as existing in plays of the Shakespearean theater. This convention allowed the presence upon the stage of a property or furnishing which was incongruous to the scene in progress, and which, during that scene, was thought of as absent, though standing in plain sight. This incongruity took two forms: either the close juxtaposition upon the stage of two properties which in reality should have been a much greater distance apart, or the presence of a property in a scene where it could never naturally have been; as a tree, for example, in the midst of a room scene. It is directly in contradiction to our modern ideal of securing complete illusion and a perfectly harmonious stage picture. A stage with such incongruity could attempt no stage picture at all; it would rather by its properties suggest as by symbols the scene of action. That the Elizabethan stage could have been so unrealistic seems to us absurd and improbable, but the probability of this staging does not depend upon whether it would be acceptable to us. If pre-Elizabethan staging exhibited this same incongruity, if there were Elizabethan customs tending to create a similarly symbolic stage, the belief that such a stage actually existed in Shakespeare's time becomes, not absurd and impossible, but thoroughly reasonable. As to

¹For illustration of the principle of staging described in Part I in connection with *Jocasta*, see Bapst, *Essai sur l'histoire du théâtre* (Paris, 1893), esp. p. 253; or (as earlier and better) the plate attached to *Il Granchio*, *Comedia di L. Salvati*. In Firenze 1566.

pre-Elizabethan conditions no special investigation is necessary, for Chambers in the *Mediaeval Stage*, and Creizenach in his *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, in tracing the development of staging from the origin of the modern drama to the time of Shakespeare, have given ample proof that a similar staging, indeed, that the identical conventions, had existed for centuries. I do not attempt even to summarize the points which they make, but only to indicate briefly how the mediæval staging with *sedes*, "houses," etc., was closely related to the staging of these plays of Shakespeare's day.

When the drama began within the churches with the liturgical plays, there was, of course, no attempt to make a completely congruous stage picture. The sepulcher¹ of the Easter play and the crib of the Christmas play² were actually and more or less realistically represented, but only symbolically suggested the rest of the picture to the auditors. The action of the play might be before a cave, on the way to the sepulcher, in the city of Jerusalem, in Galilee, where the author willed, but the place of the play was always the church. Any complete stage picture was undreamed of. When the plays moved out into the churchyard and the market-place, they kept, as Chambers shows,³ their method of presentation much as it was. He prints a plan of the Donaueschingen passion-play dating from the sixteenth century, in which the *loci*, "houses," etc., are arranged as follows, beginning at the west (?) end—hell, Gethsemane, Olivet; Herod's palace, Pilate's palace, the pillar of scourging, the pillar of the cock, the house of Caiphas, the house of Ananias, the house of the Last Supper; the graves of the dead who arise, the three crosses, the sepulcher, heaven. The incongruity of this staging is, of course, marked, consisting especially in the close juxtaposition of widely separated places. When such plays, however, came to be played on stages with these *sedes* and "houses" crowded together as portrayed by the miniatures of the Valenciennes Passion,⁴ it amounted to the presence of properties in scenes where they were not supposed to be, and both forms of incongruity were illustrated. Heaven,

¹ Chambers, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 22 ff.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 42 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 80 ff.

⁴ 1547; see Petit de Julleville, *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature françaises*, Vol. II, p. 416; or Jusserand, *Shakespeare in France*, p. 63.

beneath it a hall, then Nazareth, the temple, Jerusalem, the Golden Gate, a square sea upon which rides a ship, hell mouth—all are crowded upon the Valenciennes stage at one time. This must have been the condition in any play of the mediæval type played in a limited space. Jusserand¹ comments on this sort of staging in the following way:

Plays being acted now within a small space, inside a closed building, "simultaneous scenery" was used. On the same canvas were painted in summary fashion and in close juxtaposition all the places where the events in the play were located: a forest was represented by a tree; the Lybian mountains, by a rock; Athens, Rome, or Jerusalem, by a portico with the name written above, as in the mystery mansions, as in Gozzoli's frescoes at Pisa, as on the English stage under Elizabeth, "'Thebes' written in great letters upon an olde doore" said Sidney.²

He also quotes³ a scene-shifter's description of the scenery used in a performance of *Pandoste* at the Hotel de Bourgogne, 1631, and reproduces the original sketches: "In the center of the theater there must be a fine palace; on one side, a large prison where one can be entirely seen; on the other side a temple; below, the prow of a ship, a low sea, reeds, and steps."⁴ This was for the first day. The second day of the play required "two palaces, a peasant's house, and a wood." This play and the Valenciennes picture, therefore, show much the same condition which occurs in the Elizabethan plays under discussion—places represented close together which really should have been miles apart, and properties incongruous to all scenes but the ones they were supposed to locate, these two customs uniting to make impossible any congruous stage picture.

In English dramatic history writers have emphasized the processional plays more than the standing plays; but Chambers mentions several which he thinks were not of the former type. So a series of London plays, traceable perhaps to the beginning of the sixteenth century, was "cyclical in character but not processional."⁵ The *Creed Play* at York was stationary, and was

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 69.

² Lawrence (*Englische Studien*, Vol. XXXII, No. 1, p. 41) writes to the same effect. Neither of these writers, however, suggests the survival of the custom on the Shakespearean stage.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 70.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 71, 75.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 119.

acted in the common hall.¹ "The parochial plays," common throughout England, "were always, so far as can be seen, stationary."² The *Ludus Coventriae* Chambers thinks also a stationary play.³ Sometimes the play was actually on a platform, as at Chelmsford, Kingston, Reading, and Dublin.⁴ *The Satire of the Three Estates*, played at Cupar in 1535, was certainly a stationary play, and so was the Digby *Mary Magdalen*. In this latter were represented Mary's castle, perhaps at Bethany, Jerusalem, a stage for the devil with a place under it for hell, an arbor in which Mary lies down to sleep, Lazarus' tomb, and "Marcylle," which is separated from Jerusalem by a sea on which Mary embarks in a ship. There is apparently a rock in this sea, and a temple at Marcylle, though this is not quite so clear. Heaven seems an elevated place, to which Mary is raised; from it clouds and angels descend. The Cornish plays, given in circular playing-places, must also have been stationary; so was the Lincoln play of *Tobias*. The following passage in the town records shows its character:

1564, July: A note of the perti . . . the properties of the staige . . . played in the moneth of July anno sexto regni reginae Elizabethae, &c., in the tyme of the mayoralty of Richard Carter, whiche play was then played in Brodgaite in the seid citye, and it was of the storie of Tobias in the Old Testament.

The properties are described as follows:

Hell mouth, with a neither chap, a prison with a coveryng, Sara[s] chambre, a greate idoll with a clubb, a tombe with a coveryng, the citie of Jerusalem with towers and pynacles, the citie of Raignes with towers and pynacles, the citie of Nynyvye, the Kyng's palace of Nynyve, olde Tobyes house, the Isralytes house and the neighbures house, the Kyng's palace at Laches, a fyrmament with a fierye clowde and a duble clowde.⁵

Its cities, palaces, tombs, etc., since it was a "standing" play "played in Brodgaite," must have been used at one playing-place, and, in view of what we know of mediæval custom, simultaneously. In principle the staging could not have been very different from that represented in the Valenciennes miniature. Yet it was played in 1564, five years after Elizabeth began to reign.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

² *Ibid.*, p. 122.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 421. The division into separate pageants is due to the modern editor.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

⁵ *Hist. Mss. Com. Reports*, XIV-VIII, pp. 57, 58.

Creizenach,¹ moreover, thinks that the "houses," etc., mentioned so frequently in the records of the Revels office were for plays staged after this same manner. So ca. 1571² *Lady Barbara*, *Effiginia*, *Ajax* and *Ulysses*, *Narcisses*, *Cloridon* and *Radiamanta*, and *Paris* and *Vienna* were furnished with "apt howses, made of Canvasse, fframed, ffashioned and paynted accordingly; as mighte best serve theier severall purposes;" 1579-80,³ a *History of the Duke of Millayn and the Marques of Mantua* was furnished with "a Countie howse a Cyttye;" a *History of Alucius*, with "a Cittie, a Battlement;" a *History of the Foure Sonnes of Fabyous*, with "a Citie, a Mounthe;" a *History of Serpedon*,⁴ with "a greate Citie, a wood, a castell." Unless one supposes changes of setting, which would be difficult with such heavy properties, one must consider these plays as mediævally staged. But since they were presumably from the regular repertoire of the professional companies, these court presentations could not have differed greatly, especially in such fundamental matters, from the usual public performances of the same plays, and these records are, therefore, especially valuable not only as showing the existence in Elizabethan times of incongruous staging, but as leading to the inference of its existence on the popular stage of that time. *Thersites*⁵ also, Creizenach considers⁶ a play practically of the mediæval type. Here, then, is a direct line of English plays which were doubtless staged in the mediæval fashion, and which clearly bring the custom of the mediæval stage down to the time of Shakespeare.

Instead, therefore, of its seeming unreasonable and impossible to Englishmen to have incongruous properties on the stage, it was quite an accustomed thing, something they had long been used to. Preceding stage custom, the best possible justification and explanation of any dramatic convention, had sanctioned such staging practically since the origin of the drama. There were, moreover, numerous customs of the contemporary stage, partly

¹ *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 571.

² Cunningham, *Revels Accounts*, Vol. II, p. 13, Shak. Soc., 1842. I do not pretend to collect here from the accounts of the Revels all the information of value which they furnish concerning the properties and customs of the Elizabethan theater. That is a subject in itself deserving a separate discussion.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 153.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 155.

⁵ Ward, 1537; pr. 1537, or later.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 540.

perhaps the result of this incongruous staging, but certainly similar to it in effect,—the creation of a symbolic rather than a picture stage, that is, a stage on which the properties are intended only to suggest the scene rather than to picture it completely, congruously, and realistically. Some of these customs have already been alluded to; for example, the unlocated scene. In all the Elizabethan plays these scenes are common. They contain no hint as to the place of the supposed action; they could be imagined as occurring anywhere. Everyone admits their existence; it is therefore quite unnecessary to discuss them at length. It is necessary, however, to notice how consistent they were with the symbolic stage, but how inconsistent with our own. The old-time audience, its imagination left for the moment unemployed, did not attempt to give them any specific background, but accepted them for what they were—unlocated scenes—merely noting the progress of the plot. Modern editors feel called upon to give each its proper setting—a street, a court, a hall, a corridor—as the fancy strikes them. On a stage where the stage picture is of dominating importance such scenes are impossible; on the symbolic stage they caused no difficulty whatever.

Another custom, almost as commonly illustrated as that just spoken of, is the change of scene before the eyes of the audience. Generally without the stage being cleared of actors, the supposed place of action suddenly shifts to an entirely different place. Creizenach¹ notes illustrations of this in Zeigler's *Infanticidium*, III, 1, and in his *Nomothesia* (1574), where a three days' journey is indicated by walking about the stage. The English craft-plays also furnish examples; for instance, in the fourth play of the Towneley cycle the three days' journey of Abraham and Isaac to the mount of sacrifice is indicated in twenty-six lines (139-65). Among the illustrations in Shakespearean times are the following:

Romeo and Juliet (quarto 2, 1599; 4, undated; folio, 1623), I, 4, 5. Romeo and his friends are at first before the house of Capulet, but with the direction, "They march about the Stage, and Serving men come forth with their napkins," the scene changes to the interior of the house.

¹ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 101.

Alphonsus (1599), l. 1102: The scene up to this point has been in the palace of Amurack. "Amuracke, rise in a rage from thy chaire" (1060). He banishes his wife, and as she is angrily leaving, Medea enters, and says: "Fausta, what meanes this sudden flight of yours? Why do you leave your husbands princely Court, And all alone passe through these thickest groues." The scene has changed before our eyes from the palace to a solitary place.

Dido (1594), I, 1, l. 120: The scene up to this point is not definitely located at all, but since it is between Jupiter, Venus, and Ganymede, one would naturally assume it to be upon Olympus. It certainly is not in the midst of a wood on the seashore near Carthage, where the action from that point on is situated.

Dido (1594), II, 1, l. 306: So far, the scene is in the hall of Dido. At this line it changes suddenly to a grove.

Antonio's Revenge (1602), II, 1 (in the Quarto this is divided into two scenes, but the stage is not cleared): Up to l. 17 the action plainly is in a church about the coffin of Andrugio; the latter part of the scene is before Mellida's chambers.

The illustrations so far advanced might perhaps be explained by supposing a curtain drawn at the point where the scene changes; but no such theory will make the following comply with modern ideas of dramatic congruity. In them the scene changes by the exeunt and immediate re-entry of the characters.

The Brazen Age (1613), p. 177: Hercules, having won Deyaneira, is going away with her when he meets Nissus, and then is stopped by a stream. Nissus exits to carry Deyaneira across the stream, which is thought of as off the stage. Hercules, rushing after him, shoots him with an arrow, and Nissus at once enters, pierced by the arrow, and we learn that the stage is now supposed to represent the other shore.

English Traveller (1633), IV, 3, p. 66: "Tables and Stooles set out; Lights: a Banquet, Wine." At the end of the banquet all the family retire to their chambers, but a guest, Geraldine, is left to rest on a pallet. He cannot sleep and decides to seek the room of his hostess. "He goes in at one doore, and comes out at another"; (p. 69). The scene, in spite of the continued presence of the pallet, and perhaps of the table, is now plainly in the cor-

ridor before the bedroom. He listens at the door, hears voices within, and decides to leave the house.

Old Wives' Tale (1595): The play begins in a lonely place: travelers who have lost their way meet a smith returning home; they approach his house with him. He says: "Come, take heed for stumbling on the threshold. Open door, Madge, take in guests." She enters and says: "Come on, sit down;" and the scene is supposed now to be before the fire in the cottage. Probably they knocked at one door, were greeted by the wife, went in, and then re-entered at another door, so indicating the change of scene.

Iron Age (1632), p. 379: The Greek soldiers are besieging Troy. "Now with a soft march enter at this breach," they say. "They march softly in at one doore, and presently in [out] at another." After this direction the scene is near the wooden horse, which stands within the city.

Sometimes the scene is changed merely by the characters walking about the stage, as it probably was in the illustration just cited from *Romeo and Juliet*. *Faustus* (1604), sc. 11: Faustus having astonished the emperor by his powers, says he wishes to go home, and that he prefers to walk "in this fair and pleasant green," rather than ride. By the end of the scene he is at home, and sits down to sleep in his chair. The 1616 version has no such confusion of place.

George-a-Greene (1599), ll. 1037, 1038. The shoemaker seated at his work sees Jenkins and picks a fight with him which is to occur at the town's end. "Come, sir, wil you go to the townes end now sir?" "I sir, come." In this interval they are supposed to go. The line continues: "Now we are at the townes end, what say you now?"

If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody (1605), p. 244: The scene opens with a great procession. "Queen takes state"—that is, she ascends her throne; after which she pardons her enemies and oppressors. When this is over, Elizabeth says: "And now to London, lords, lead on the way." "Sennet about the Stage in order," is the following direction. Then the mayor of London meets them, saying, "I from this citie London," bring gifts."

Sir John Oldcastle (1600), ll. 491-701: At the beginning the scene is before Lord Cobham's house (499); by 600 it is before an inn, and by 680, where the Aleman says, "You draw not in my house," it is within the inn, all without any clearing of the stage. In 902-1162 a journey to Lord Cobham's is similarly made. At 1008 the house is supposed to come in sight; at 1132 the action is before it.

Arden of Feversham (1592), III, 6: Arden is on his way to Raynum Downs. His servant's horse is lame, and the servant leaves Arden, being told to overtake him before reaching the downs. Lines 61-94 indicate the rest of the journey before the downs are reached.

Captain Thomas Stukeley (1605), ll. 120-335: An old man is going to Tom's chamber. He walks from an inn to the house of Stukeley, the scene being supposed to change finally to the chamber itself.

Sometimes, instead of the scene's shifting, the stage at the same moment represented two widely separated places. Creizenach, in discussing another point of mediæval staging,¹ gives the following which is applicable here: "Noch 1609, in der Widmung vor seinem *Paulus Naufragus* rühmt sich Balthasar Crusius, er stelle nicht verschiedene Orte zugleich dar und dehne das Theater nicht aus wie eine Landkarte."² This parting of the stage into different continents, this labeling of the doors, what is it but a modernization of the mediæval staging? Sidney's 'Asia of one side and Africa of the other,' Mayne's "the stage was still a stage, two entrances Were not two parts o' the world disjoin'd by seas," already quoted, show that the same thing was true in England. A typical illustration of this from the plays of Shakespeare is to be found in *Richard III* (1597), V, 3, where the tents of the two rival generals are represented upon the stage at once, and therefore of course much closer together than they could naturally have been.

A slightly different example occurs in *Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1607, Queen's), p. 90. "Enter three seuerall waies the three Brothers; Robert with the state of Persia as

¹ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 102.

² See also *ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 101, 102.

before, Sir Anthonie with the King of Spaine and others, where hee receiues the Order of Saint Iago, and other Officers; Sir Thomas, in England, with his Father and others. Fame giues to each a prospectiue glasse, they seme to see one another and offer to embrace, at which Fame parts them, and so: Exeunt." Fame goes on to explain that each is in the country in which he was just represented, and the play closes.

A very similar scene occurs in *Eastward Ho* (1605), IV, 1. The scene is laid near the Thames at Cuckold's Haven. "Enter Slitgut with a pair of ox-horns, discovering Cuckold's Haven above"—probably a scene-board to that effect. He mounts a tree to leave upon it, according to custom, his master's tribute of the ox-horns, and from that height—either of a tree upon the stage or of the balcony—comments on what he sees. "And now let me discover from this lofty prospect," he says, "what pranks the rude Thames plays in her desperate lunacy." He sees a boat cast away and one of her passengers swimming; "his next land is even just below me." At these words Security enters and Slitgut greets him. Security exits and Slitgut again looks about him. He sees a woman swimming to shore at St. Katharine's and immediately the woman and a waiter in a tavern at St. Katharine's come on the stage below him and, acting their parts, are supposed to exit into the tavern there; Slitgut sees Quicksilver land at Wapping, and Quicksilver appears on the lower stage in a short soliloquy; then a party appears on the stage as at the Isle of Dogs; they meet Quicksilver, who a moment before was at Wapping, and a little later Security, who landed at Cuckold's Haven, enters to knock at the tavern in St. Katharine's. Finally, when all on the lower stage have gone, Slitgut descends with the words: "Now will I descend my honorable prospect; the farthest seeing sea-mark of the world; no marvel then, if I could see two miles about me." The tree or balcony was throughout the scene supposed to represent Cuckold's Haven, but the lower stage at the same time was Cuckold's Haven, St. Katharine's, Wapping, the Isle of Dogs, St. Katharine's, and then Cuckold's Haven again.

These examples of change of scene and of absolute simultane-

ity of scene show how greatly the Elizabethan stage differed from our own in its very conception and principle. It is plainly enough not a picture stage, but almost exactly analogous to the old stage of mediæval days. So far nothing corresponding to the "houses," etc., has been called attention to, but the juxtaposition of places far apart is plainly of frequent occurrence. The stage represents now this place, now that, without any division of scenes; or, even more boldly, this place *and* that at the same moment. Actors remain upon the stage, while it, like the magic carpet, shifts them about wherever the dramatist wishes. We are accustomed still to the convention of dramatic time by which we allow two hours to pass in ten minutes; or, in the act intervals, twenty years in a quarter of an hour. We have lost the very similar convention of dramatic distance, if one may coin a new term, which, no more illogically nor unreasonably, allowed two feet to represent as many miles, and annihilated space as the other does time.

The plays, however, do show exact parallels to the incongruous "houses." Percy's play, *Cuckqueens' and Cuckolds' Errands* (MSS dated 1601),¹ does not differ in principle from the plays of the Middle Ages. Instead of hell, Galilee, Nazareth, Jerusalem, represented by some sort of structure, Harwich, Maldon, Colchester are represented by labels displayed *simultaneously* upon the stage. When the scene was at Maldon, for example, the sign of Harwich was as incongruous and realistically improbable as the presence of Nazareth and Jerusalem on the same stage. All plays with scene-boards which represented different places must have offered similar illustrations. The only reason why the *Faery Pastoral* (MSS dated 1603) and *Aphrodisial* (MSS dated 1602) do not clearly indicate this same thing is because their scenes are laid in imaginary places where distance is unknown. The quotations from Sidney and Mayne must be a third time referred to, to remind the reader how long the custom of scene-boards continued; it will be noticed that it is not against the scene-boards themselves, but against this very matter of unreality, that both critics were contending.

¹ See the directions quoted in Part I of this study.

It may be objected that scene-boards are not real properties and do not correspond to the old "houses." One can allow incongruous signs more readily than incongruous settings. But the *Errands* with its ladder and its Image of Tarlton, and the *Faery Pastoral* with its chapel, kiln, cot, oak, etc., certainly show incongruous properties which cannot be disputed, and which would have spoiled the complete realism of the stage picture, had any been attempted. The scene already referred to in the *English Traveler* (1633), IV, 3, was also incongruously staged; for though the scene had changed from a dining-room into a corridor, the pallet on which Geraldine had slept must still have remained in sight. So in the scene of *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*. While the procession passed about the stage symbolizing the journey to London, the throne Elizabeth had used still remained in its place. Practically all the examples of clashes noted in the preceding discussion of the alternation theory could be used as proofs of this incongruous staging. The weaker the argument to prove that the doors and balcony were outside the curtains, the stronger is the evidence for incongruity of staging. If the doors and balcony were all on the rear stage, so that it could not be concealed while they were in sight, the following scenes, already described, must, for example, have presented incongruity:

Antonio's Revenge (1602), II, 1: The hearse of Andrugio certainly remained on the stage till the end of the scene, and would be an incongruous property when in the midst of the scene the place of action changed to the space before Mellida's chamber.

Wounds of Civil War (1594), V, 2: If the balcony was not outside the curtain and there was no pause in the play, the throne used in sc. 3 must have been on throughout sc. 2, even though the throne was the seat of Sulla at Rome and the scene was happening before Preneste.

David and Bethsabe (1599), I, 2: If the curtain did not hide the balcony and there was no pause in the play, the "spring" in which Bethsabe bathed must have remained on in this scene, before the walls of Rabath.

Probably these scenes are best explained by supposing the

alcove stage. There are scenes, however, in the old plays which the alcove stage will not explain, and which no assumed confusion or omission of the text will account for—scenes in which it is clear that properties were on the stage during scenes to which they were not at all suitable.

Tamburlaine (1592), IV, 2: The scene is described as before Damascus: "Now may we see Damascus' lofty tower" (l. 102). Tamburlaine orders Bajazeth brought forth and makes him serve as his footstool: "Tamburlaine get up on him to his chair" (l. 30). Though the scene is clearly out of doors in the open country, an elevated regal chair is nevertheless introduced without comment or explanation. Similar scenes occur in *David and Bethsabe*, II, 4, and *Wonder of Women*, V, 2.

English Traveller (1633), IV, p. 79: The scene is outside a house. A number of gentlemen, in order to entrap Reignald, a servant who has been deceiving them, "withdraw behind the Arras," says the direction. Whether this arras were the curtain or not, whether it was open or drawn across the stage, it certainly was not a suitable furnishing for a street scene. Such incongruity must have existed in practically every scene where the stage was supposed to represent anything but a room, for the curtain in every out scene was ever present.

Titus Andronicus (1600), I, 1: We have become accustomed to this scene from its presence in Shakespeare; but what is the congruity of having a private tomb represented in the same scene as a meeting of the Senate? It only shows that, in the matter of dramatic convention, custom and not reason dominates. Whether we should so lightly pass over the incongruity of this scene if it were actually represented on our picture stage is doubtful.

Sapho and Phao (1584), IV, 3: Sapho, presumably in bed, and her maids tell each other their dreams. At the end Sapho orders them to "draw the curtaine." The maids are not directed to go out. Scene 4 is at the shop of Vulcan where he and his men make the arrows for Venus. There is no direct demand for a forge, but something, it seems, must have been used, since the making was plainly acted upon the stage. Bond supposes the

forge to have been behind the curtain; when the curtains were closed after sc. 2 the room furnishings may, it is true, have been removed, and the forge setting put in their place, the curtain being opened in sc. 4 when the making of the arrows began. Act V seems to continue without a break, however, Venus and Cupid continuing upon the stage. Venus says she "will tarrie for Cupid at the forge," while he goes to Sapho—a remark useless and meaningless unless the forge is on the stage and she actually does remain by it. Venus continues to wait for Cupid into sc. 2, which is in Sapho's chamber again, until finally, in the middle of the scene, she detects Cupid in Sapho's lap. Yet the forge has not been removed. The next and final scene of the comedy is before the cave of Sybilla. Clearly, if a forge existed—and if it did not, why the useless speech of Venus?—it was on the stage at the same time that the scene of action was in Sapho's court. If there is anything at all in the "clashes" of properties—that is, if the performance was continuous—and if anything represented the cave, it also must have been upon the stage during the same scene, and, since it is used frequently in the play, perhaps was on during the whole performance.

Parasitaster (1606), IV, 1: Bullen says the scene is within the palace. Gonzago enters in full state. But at l. 638 Dulcimet, his daughter, says: "Father, do you see that tree, that leans just on my chamber window?" Line 650, she says to him: "To Dulcimet's chamber-window A well-grown plane tree spreads his happy arms." Line 700, the Duke says to Tiberio: "This plane tree was not planted here To get into my daughter's chamber." This sounds very much as if an actual tree were intended, though it need not necessarily be on the stage. But the next act shows that it probably is. The action of V, 1, obviously in the same scene, is told sufficiently in the directions: "Whilst the Act is a-playing, Hercules and Tiberio enter; Tiberio climbs the tree, and is received above by Dulcimet, Philocalia, and a Priest: Hercules stays beneath;" (l. 128) "The Duke enters . . . and takes his state;" (l. 145) several people "lead Cupid to his state;" (l. 461) "Tiberio and Dulcimet above are discovered hand in hand." In short, a tree and a throne were both on the

stage at one time, the scene being supposed to be *at once* the inside and the outside of the palace; or, to state it more exactly, nowhere at all, because no scene, no background, was conceived of.

The Brazen Age (1613): This highly spectacular play, surprising as it is in its demands upon the staging, was performed upon a public stage, or, if not performed, written by Heywood, an experienced playwright, who would not absolutely violate theatrical custom.¹ The objection that the *Brazen Age* is too much like a masque to use it for evidence of popular methods does not apply either, for it was played, if played at all, in a popular playhouse and must have conformed to playhouse customs. There could have been little difference anyway between masques and popular plays in such fundamental dramatic conventions as these. If anything, the masques, appealing to the cultured and critical audience at the court, would have been the more realistic and the less likely to use this staging under discussion. Any illustration of it from the *Brazen Age* gets therefore added force from this consideration as well as the later date of the play.

Act 5, sc. 3, is as follows: Scene 2 was at Omphale's, where the Greek heroes have come to rouse Hercules from his effeminate captivity. He goes to make a vow at Jove's altar, Omphale remaining in soliloquy. Scene 3 begins with: "Enter to the sacrifice two Priests to the Altar, sixe Princes with sixe of his labours, in the midst Hercules bearing his two brazen pillars, six other Princes, with the other six labours, Hercules staies them." Lychas brings him, as in the familiar story, the poisoned shirt, and Hercules puts it on. "All the Princes kneel to the Altar." Hercules is seized with agony and goes out raging, the others except Lychas following him. Hercules returns directly to Lychas and kills him. The scene meanwhile must have shifted, for Omphale says:

¹That these plays of the Ages were probably performed the following quotations show: In "To the Reader" of *The Golden Age*, Heywood says: "This is the *Golden Age*, the eldest brother of three Ages that have aduentured the Stage, but the onely one yet that hath beene iudged to the Presse." *The Brazen Age* is in its address to the reader called "the third brother," but has no mention of acting. "To the Reader" of *The Iron Age*, after speaking of the *Gold, Silver, Brass, and Iron Ages*—the last in two parts—continues: "Lastly, I desire thee to take notice, that these were the Playes often (and not with the least applause) Publickely Acted by two Companies, vpon one Stage at once, and haue at sundry times thronged three severall Theaters, with numerous and mighty Auditories." Though "these plays" could refer to the two parts of *The Iron Age*, this is, as Ward says (Vol. II, p. 578), quite improbable. All four were probably given on the stage.

"Beneath this rocke where we haue often kist, I will lament."
 "Enter Hercules from a rocke aboue, tearing downe trees."
 Hercules kils Omphale with a peece of a rocke," and appeals to the Princes to help him in his agony. "All the Princes break downe the trees and make a fire, in which Hercules placeth himselfe."
 "He burnes his Club, and Lyons Skin." "Iupiter aboue strikes him with a thunder-bolt, his body sinkes and from the heauens discends a hand in a cloud, that from the place where Hercules was burnt, brings vp a starre and fixeth in the firmament." A report comes of Deyaneira's death and at the command of Jason to "take vp these monuments of his twelue labours", the princes exeunt, bearing off the pillars, which in spite of the change of scene from temple to open wilderness, have remained upon the stage. Even if this play were not performed, Heywood obviously writes it with the stage in mind: the conventions it illustrates are those of the stage, and one of those conventions is certainly that of incongruous properties.

These are not all the possible examples of scenes where a property is upon the stage during a scene to which it is unsuitable, but they are the best and clearest I have found. Other plays, however, illustrate the incongruous staging in another way. Suppose a play shows in several scenes scattered through it the use of the same property or setting, which is heavy or for some reason difficult to fix in place. Or suppose a property so used is small and unobtrusive. Is it not reasonable to suppose, in view of the fact that incongruous properties were allowed upon the stage, that these plays illustrate such a usage? Some examples have already been given: the tree in the *Parasitaster* used through acts IV and V; the cave, if one existed, in *Sapho and Phao*, referred to in II, 1, 2, 4; V, 3; the lodge, etc., of the *Faery Pastoral*; the ladder of the *Cuckqueens' and Cuckolds' Errands*; and the labels of the same play. *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* (1590) has hung up through most of the play the arms of the Three Lords, for they are all alluded to again and again (pp. 378, 403, 458, 473, for example). The scene does not change very much, almost approaching to a classical type of staging, but certainly does a little; and in these scenes the arms were incongruous.

The Case is Altered (acted 1599), III, 2, is another example of the small unobtrusive property. Jacques in this scene hides his gold in a hole in his yard and covers it with horse-dung. Scene 3 is at Ferneze's house; IV, 1, 2, are in the same; in sc. 3 Juniper is in his shop singing, presumably on the rear stage; but sc. 4 is the same as III, 2, with the pile of horse-dung undisturbed as Jacques left it. To imagine that it had remained there all the time is not difficult, and, in view of the other illustrations presented, perhaps it will not be too much to suppose that the tree into which Onion climbs had also been on the stage throughout the intervening scenes. Since the shop scenes almost certainly, and the house scenes, very probably, were on the rear stage, the tree and dung would be both on the front stage, and incongruous during those scenes.

Alphonsus (1599, but written 1589?): This play is an illustration of incongruous staging, if any property for woods existed. It is one of the plays which go far toward proving that such a property did exist, for it so uselessly, and yet so consistently, alludes to it. It is easy enough to see why a dramatist, when a plot imperatively demands a background of woods, might put in lines referring to them, even though no real setting was employed; but when the imagined situation does not require woods, or when it is actually out of keeping with the presence of woods, such textual allusions can be explained most naturally by supposing that some such setting actually existed, and that the textual allusions perhaps arise from its presence upon the stage.¹ Scene 1 is practically unlocated, but in it Venus, whom the stage directions bade to "stand aside," comes forth saying: "From thickest shrubs dame Venus did espie The mortall hatred which you ioyntly beare." (92, 93). In sc. 2 Carinus bids farewell to his son Alphonsus, and says: "Meantime Carinus in this sillie groue Will spend his daies with praiers and horizons" (179, 180).

In II, 1, Alphonsus overcomes Flaminus, the usurper of the

¹ The proof for wood settings, though not absolutely convincing, is stronger than that for almost any other property, the existence of which must be established from the plays alone. It is too long to be given here, but will be discussed in a later paper on Elizabethan properties. Brodmeier admits their existence (p. 65). If they existed, they took sometimes the form of separate trees, for in a large majority of cases a single tree is used as part of the wood scene.

throne, and bids one of the nobles bring back his army "Into this wood" (455). Though this is not the same wood as that in sc. 2, nor probably that in sc. 1, the setting seems the same. But in the midst of the scene is the direction, "Alphonsus sit in the Chaire;" and the place of action seems quite uncertain. Near the end of the scene Laelius leads in the soldiers spoken of before, and says to them: "Let vs lurke within the secret shade Which he [Alphonsus] himselfe appointed vnto vs" (699, 700).

Act III, sc. 1, is before Naples, but requires either chairs for three kings or one long seat. Sc. 2 is at the Turkish court, and since the scene is one of ceremony and Amurack is certainly sitting, it is possible that "chaire" means a throne. After the visitors are gone, Amurack—his wife Fausta and his daughter sitting at his feet—falls asleep, and Medea conjures up visions before him, Colchas rising up through a trapdoor "in a white Cirples [surplice] and a Cardinals Myter." The visions concern the fate of his daughter, and Amurack describes them in his sleep. They anger his wife, who wakes him. "Amuracke rise in a rage from thy chaire." He banishes her, but (the direction is addressed to Fausta) "Make as though you were agoing out, Medea meete her and say, 'Fausta, what meanes this sudden flight of yours? Why do you leaue your husbands princely Court, And all alone passe through these thickest groues.'" Fausta replies: "No toy . . . nor foolish fancie ledde me to these groues." The groves and chair were on the stage at the same time; probably the grove remained on through all the play, or at least to the end of this act.

Two Lamentable Tragedies (1601): This play tells in alternating scenes the story of two murders, one in London, the other in Italy. The London story uses two shops. If anything besides the doors represented the two shops—and it is necessary to see into both—it is not easy to imagine that the shops were taken off during each scene in Padua. Perhaps labels above the doors and signs were all the furnishings; but even then incongruity would result.

Alexander and Campaspe (1584): Bond¹ supposes the tub of

¹ Vol. II, p. 545.

Diogenes brought on and carried off each time, this being necessary sometimes in the midst of scenes. It is much simpler to imagine the tub on the stage all the time, and that it was supposed included in the scene of action only when alluded to.

Wonder of Women (1606, Blackfriars): This play has already been alluded to several times, once to prove that the doors were not concealed by the curtain. I believe that the evidence of the play shows this statement to be true; but if it does not, and if the doors did open on the rear stage, the result is to make the staging only more incongruous than ever. The principal illustration occurs in the third and fourth acts. Act III, sc. 1, is in the palace of Syphax at Citra. He is trying to compel Sophonisba to yield to him, and enters, dragging her in. She finally feigns consent, only stipulating that she be allowed to offer a private sacrifice. He gives the desired permission, but leaves behind him Vangue, his slave, to watch her, and bribes her maid Zanthia. "Enter under the conduct of Zanthia and Vangue the solemnity of a sacrifice; which being entered, whilst the attendants furnish the altar, Sophonisba sings a song." She sends away all but Vangue and Zanthia, and, making Vangue drunk, "They lay Vangue in Syphax' bed and draw the curtains." Then Sophonisba escapes through a vault which leads from the bedchamber to "a grove one league from Citra." Syphax enters immediately, and, "offering to leap into bed, he discovers Vangue," whom he kills, and then, sending Zanthia before him, he goes through the vault in pursuit of Sophonisba.

So far all is congruous enough. If the curtains referred to are those of the rear stage, the door presumably, the trap and the altar certainly, are on the front stage. If only bed curtains are intended, all, so far as yet appears, may be on the rear stage. Sc. 2, however, begins with the direction: "Enter Scipio and Laelius with the complements of Roman Generals before them. At the other door, Massinissa [the husband of Sophonisba] and Jugurth."¹ This mention of the doors shows that the doors cer-

¹ It may be objected that all the rear-stage furnishings might have been removed while the curtains were closed, and the curtains again opened for sc. 2. But the succeeding scenes make this unlikely. Of course, if one wished to suppose even sc. 2 played with the bed, etc., in view, the doors may have opened upon the curtained space. This, however, would only add another example of incongruity—and throughout this argument I am endeavoring to accept every possible objection and to limit myself to unmistakable illustrations.

tainly were outside the curtains, but does not make clear whether altar and trap were or not. The scene is unlocated, and is only eighty-five lines long.

Act IV opens at the other end of the secret passage. "Enter Sophonisba and Zanthia, as out of a cave's mouth." From the textual allusions this is clearly in a forest. One may doubt, however, that any wood-setting was used, since this is the only scene in the play requiring it. Yet if the theater had such a setting for other plays, perhaps it was used here also. Syphax enters soon after Sophonisba, and, once more failing in winning her, sends her away. Then he summons up a witch, Erictho, who promises to put Sophonisba in his power by means of charms. When he sees Sophonisba approaching his bed, he is to say nothing and have no light by. While Erictho is off the stage working her charms there is much music, among other directions indicating this being: "A treble viol, a base lute, etc., play softly within the canopy" (l. 201); then "Enter Erictho in the shape of Sophonisba, her face veiled, and hasteth to the bed of Syphax." After a short speech, "Syphax hasteneth within the canopy, as to Sophonisba's bed," and the act closes.

Here three things are noticeable: first, the change of scene without clearing the stage, with the sudden reference to a bed in the midst of a wood scene; second, the use of the term "canopy" as if the bed were concealed behind it; and, third, the position of the trap outside the canopy. The "canopy"¹ seems equivalent to the curtains of the rear stage. Yet the use of incongruous properties here is not as yet illustrated, unless one assume a wood-setting on the front stage, for the bed was concealed by the curtain, and the curtain, so commonly incongruous in out scenes, may for the moment be disregarded.

Act V continues the action from the point where Act IV left off. The direction reads: "Syphax draws the curtain," certainly from within, "and discovers Erictho lying with him"—perhaps this is the bed curtain. "They leap out of bed." "Erictho slips into the ground as Syphax offers his sword to her." Syphax

¹ This term seems used with a similar meaning in other plays; e. g., Percy's *Faery Pastoral*, "Lowest of all over the Canopie ΝΑΗΑΙΤΒΟΔΑΙΟΝ or Faery Chappell. In V, 5, characters went into this chapel and "seated themselves both."

kneels at the altar cursing when "Out of the altar the ghost of Asdrubal ariseth."

The altar was near the trap, probably in front of it, so the ghost could seem to rise from the altar; the trap was outside the canopy, as we saw in the preceding act; therefore the altar was also outside the canopy or rear-stage curtain. It would hardly have been removed from there during Act IV, and, if not, would in that scene have been an incongruous property. Why should it have been removed? This incongruity would not have disturbed anybody, for in V, 2, where the scene is a battlefield, there is a textual allusion, "Seize that hill," and the following directions; "Scipio leads his train up to the mount;" "Scipio passeth to his throne." A battlefield with a throne is no more incongruous than a wood with an altar.

The Old Wives' Tale (1595, Queen's): The stage in this play was either the alcove stage, with the alcove arranged as a study, or a stage of one of the other types, with a door or a structure for the study. The study was probably concealed by a curtain (p. 343, where Delia is discovered sitting asleep). In front of this curtain, but, if one chooses, behind the regular stage curtain, stood a large cross and a well (some arrangement of the trap), in no way associated in the play, and perhaps not on the stage at the same time; there was also, near the study or cell, a turf which concealed a glass holding a light. There were on the stage, probably all of the time, a table, chairs or seats of some kind, and perhaps a wood-setting. That the study, the cross and the turf, and the study, the well and the turf, were on the stage together, though the study and the well, and the study and the cross, are not supposed to be related at all, is shown by the following scheme of properties:

Pp. 309-13, cross; 314, interlude by harvest men; 314-18, cross; 318-22, study, turf, and light, probably a table; 322-26, cross; 327, song by harvest men; 327-31, before the cell or study; the turf and light; 331-36, well, before the study; 336-39, table; 339-41, the well; 341-47, before the study, the turf and light, the trap.

How were these plays staged? The simplest and most reasonable answer seems to me to be that at the beginning of the play

all the heavy, naturally immovable properties to be used throughout the performance were in place, either on the front or rear stage, whichever one thinks more probable; or, better, with some on the front stage and others behind the curtains. In the *Old Wives' Tale* perhaps the well-setting was not put on until p. 327 during the song, since it was not necessary until after that point. Plays in which any property was used but once probably had it placed behind the curtain, where it could be quickly and easily arranged, discovered, and removed to make way for the next. Properties like beds or banquets were, when circumstances forbade the use of the rear stage or its convenient arrangement, brought on and carried off at the point where the action demanded. But properties, either difficult to move, like the well in *Old Wives' Tale*, or so small as to be unobtrusive, like the turf and light, were, when once brought on, left upon the stage as long as they were to be used, even though some scenes intervened to which they were inappropriate. As each of them was to be noticed by the audience some allusion was made to it in the text or it was used in the action; otherwise it was not thought present any more than the Elizabethan gallants seated around it.

It may be objected that this solution is not the only possible one, that there are very few illustrations cited, and that the whole is too unreasonable to be accepted. On the contrary, this incongruity is more reasonable than the logical and harmonious alternation staging. It would be strange indeed if the mediæval customs, which the studies of Creizenach, Chambers, and Jusserand show to have continued down to the time of Elizabeth, had suddenly been obliterated. It would be stranger still if, in the midst of such incongruities as the use of scene-boards and the change of scene within a scene, absolute congruity in regard to properties should have existed. Instead of the incongruous staging being unreasonable, it is, from the point of view of history, the most reasonable of all. It is not fair to attempt to force the plays into other forms. Of course, by assuming that, in the *Old Wives' Tale*, for example, the cross was removed at the end of each scene in which it was used, and replaced again at the beginning of the next scene in which it was required, the incon-

gruity can be explained away. But why should one do so? The scenes from *Tamburlaine*, *Titus Andronicus*, *The Parasitaster*, *The Brazen Age*, etc., cannot be so explained; *The Cuckqueens' and Cuckolds' Errands* cannot by any scheme be made other than incongruous; dramatic distance, and change of scene within scenes, surely existed. Merely because our notions of propriety do not allow such things now is no reason for denying them in the past. It is true that there are comparatively few examples; if there had been many, they would not so long have escaped observation. The large number of lost plays, moreover, especially of this earlier period, must not be forgotten. For one illustration still existing, there may originally have been a dozen. It is also necessary to notice that of existing plays only a very few are at all definite as to their staging, and that, the more circumstantial and precise the directions, the more the traces of incongruous staging. If the inconclusive plays had been published with complete and specific directions, the chances are that our list of examples would be doubled. I have used as my tests of incongruity the presence in the same scene of incongruous properties, and the recurrence in a play of a property not easily moved or too small to be much in the way. This is a severe test, a situation which few plots would be likely to bring about. There are probably other manifestations of mediæval custom on the Elizabethan stage which we know nothing of and which we have as yet no means of detecting. There are other plays, such as *Dido*, *Histriomastix*, *Love's Metamorphosis*, which I think furnish examples when tried even by these tests, but which are not certain enough to be cited as evidence. In view of these considerations, even the few illustrations assume an importance out of proportion to their number. The fact that the plays from which they are drawn vary widely in date, in author, and in place of production, renders them all the more valuable and makes the proof of the existence of an incongruous staging on the Elizabethan stage as sure as any proof on such a subject can be.

One may almost say, indeed, that it is the only theory of staging which could have been true of the Shakespearean theater. That theater could not, in the very nature of things, have had a

picture stage: the shifts of scene just alluded to forbade it; the spectators seated upon the stage forbade it; the ever-present curtain as a background for all front-stage scenes forbade it. If the dramatists had attempted to secure perfect realism, they would have been bound to stricter rules than the Greeks. The chorus was liberty itself as compared with these conditions; for the chorus could be of any city and of any time; the Elizabethan stage audience was always Elizabethan and the scene must always have been London. The very strictness of the bonds compelled them to be broken, and the stage for the playwright of Shakespeare's day was necessarily only a platform upon which his characters stood, while the scene was anywhere his fancy dictated or his plot required. The properties did not picture the background, they only suggested and symbolized it.

This conclusion explains several things in connection with the plays. The curtain, so necessary in the view of the alternationists, becomes of secondary importance, and one understands why there are so few directions for it. Possibly not many more rear-stage scenes occurred than the directions definitely indicate. One understands, too, why there are so few directions for the use of properties, though the textual demands are more numerous, and though we know that the stage was furnished with fair completeness. If they were put in place at the beginning of the play and remained throughout the performance, directions concerning them would be useless. For example, the table, which seems so often assumed as present, probably was present most of the time, standing out of the way in one corner when not in use, and, when desired, brought into the center of the stage. Perhaps, too, this custom explains the number of textual allusions to properties: these allusions were possibly inserted, not to take the place of properties, but to indicate which, at the moment, were to be noticed. This, however, could not have been very necessary. There is no reason for supposing that a large number of properties ever crowded the stage. *The Old Wives' Tale* and the *Faery Pastoral*—the first with its cross, well, study, and turf; the second with its kiln, cot, oak, and well—are certainly more crowded than most of the plays.

Certain opinions concerning the Elizabethan theaters are confirmed by this incongruous staging. One of these is not, however, that which pictures the Shakesperean audience as primitive and childlike in imagination. That they accepted such an unrealistic staging was a result, not of any peculiar quality of their minds, but of their education and previous dramatic experience. It does not show that they were lacking in a desire for realism in their stage productions. Hardly a page of the accounts of the office of the Revels, which arranged the court plays, but shows how strong this desire was. But the desire for realism seems to have been concerned more with the individual properties than with a realistic general setting. In every consideration of the Elizabethan theater the fact must be remembered that it was not an illusion, a picture stage, but that it was largely symbolic. From that point of view, its body of stage customs is complex, but reasonable; from any other, it is absurd and inexplicable.

The opinion, often expressed, that the poetry of this drama was largely owing to the conditions of its production is in a measure true. The stage was certainly fairly provided with furnishings, but creating little scenic allusion, could not adequately create "atmosphere," and it became the task of the poet to do the work of the scene-painter. Not so much by description of the actual imagined setting—that would only increase the incongruity—but by the general tone which the poetry gives, Shakespeare and almost all the early dramatists strove to illumine their symbolic stage.

As the symbolic stage increased the task of the dramatist by requiring that he supply the background which it could not, it at the same time gave him greater freedom. Many have called attention to the influence in this way of the triple stage; the incongruous staging certainly increased it also. Because of this freedom, the drama was able to deal with many subjects no longer considered possible to it. The constructive importance of acts and scenes seems almost to have been unobserved; almost every scene began with an entrance and ended, not with a situation, but with an exit, binding the whole play into one connected story; while in many cases the plot was not dramatic, but

rather a history, a novel, or a romance told in dialogue. *Tamburlaine* is such a play; so are most of Shakespeare's historical plays. They begin at the beginning, and they tell the whole story with all its details. It is useless to attempt to fit them into the dramatic strait-jacket of exposition, climax, and resolution. What is obviously true of these plays is probably true of many others. One may be permitted to question whether it ever occurred to most of the dramatists that there was such a thing as dramatic construction in the sense in which we understand it; and to doubt if there is much advantage, except a possible pedagogic one, in striving to make their plays comply with this modern theory. Rather, theirs was a narrative art, and their subjects were often narrative subjects. They dealt with these subjects as a novelist does, giving the smaller points as well as the greater. Often the plays lack any dominating conflict, but are rather a series of dramatic situations clustered about some single figure. To say that this was all a result of the stage construction and stage customs would be extreme and untrue, but their influence must have been great. In its fulness of treatment of the story, in its narrative rather than its dramatic art, in its greater range of subject, the Elizabethan drama shows the influence of the Elizabethan stage.

Which of the four forms of staging—the simple method of the early days, the classical method of *Jocasta*, the alternation staging, or the incongruous—was most prevalent, is a question which must, in the very nature of things, remain open. The classical form could not have been very common, for the plays in their frequent changes of scene would not allow it. The others seem rather to have been used together than in any separate and carefully distinguished way. *The Old Wives' Tale*, for example, may have changed during the outer scenes the study of Sacrapant into a place where Delia is discovered asleep, so illustrating the alternation principle; but the previous presence of incongruous properties shows the staging of the play to have been symbolic also. Absolute tests for both alternation and incongruity are lacking; it is therefore impossible to give any definite answer to the question opening the paragraph. But if the question be

varied to ask what is the relative frequency of apparent confusion and consistency, some answer may be attempted. For as these changes of place within the scene, this dramatic distance, this incongruity of properties are all confusion from our point of view, so alternation is consistency and orderliness. This is, indeed, one of the arguments against it. What chance was there for orderliness or consistency, such as the alternation theory demands, on a stage where there was so much confusion and incoherence? The alternation theory really means an approach to the modern notion of an harmonious stage picture. There was no chance for the congruity it demands, unless one grant the existence of the alcove rear stage. In that case it is conceivable that the Elizabethan theater presented a stage at once modern and mediæval in its customs. By 1603 the mediæval customs were not gone out of use; the symbolic use of properties, incongruity, the convention of dramatic distance, still existed. But on the rear stage, if we are not compelled to suppose every scene using the door, the balcony, or properties, as behind the curtain, there may have been presented a congruous stage picture, especially if the rear stage were not too large to be furnished with fair completeness. Even in the *Wonder of Women*, for example, the rear stage could then in every important detail have represented a bedroom, and though the altar, the throne, even the trees perhaps, were all in plain sight on the front stage, in mediæval fashion, the rear stage would nevertheless be coherent and harmonious in itself.

If this was actually the case, and complete realism was once really introduced even in a few scenes, it is easy to see that the tendency would be to make all the play similarly realistic, and that the mediæval customs would gradually disappear. This would be true because the people were naturally fond of realism and delighted in it, and because men like Sidney and Jonson, accustomed to classical unity and propriety, were already objecting to the old incongruity.

But it seems to me impossible to trace, during the strict Elizabethan period at least, any marked decay of mediæval custom. The illustrations which I have cited date from the last

years of the period quite as often as from the earlier years. Only two cases showing elimination of incongruity are known to me, and they may be purely fortuitous.¹

Plays really illustrating these incongruities may, of course, from our imperfect means of detecting them, pass unnoticed, and other forms of incongruity may also have existed of which we know nothing. Perhaps a critical study of all the plays produced between 1559 and 1642 would show more clearly the way in which the mediæval customs were lost in the modern, but that is outside my present inquiry. All I am attempting to show is that in 1603 the English theater still exhibited in the apparent confusion of its staging traces of mediæval influence.

"Apparent" confusion, however, for the incongruous staging is incongruous only so long as we insist upon looking at it from a modern point of view. If we once fully admit that the Elizabethan stage was hardly more than a platform for acting and not a mimic world in itself, the performance of a play with "incongruous" staging becomes no more incongruous than is the performance of a modern public reader. Genée² and Kilian³ have both noted the symbolic nature of the Elizabethan front stage, but they have not noted, or have indeed denied these farther proofs of symbolism—the scene-boards, dramatic distance, incongruous properties, etc., the very customs which make the recognition of symbolism most necessary and most important. To insist upon the modern point of view as regards the staging of the old plays is, of course, to make them seem unreasonable and absurd. So long as editors continue to introduce into the old plays their own misleading divisions into scenes and their own

¹ *Faustus* (1604), sc. 11, shows a shift of scene which the 1616 version avoids. *James IV* (1598) has two sets of act interludes. One set (printed by Manly between each act) indicates exits at the end of each interlude, and the references to "our harbour" (351), "our sell" (369), suggests that Oberon and Bohun concealed themselves in the tomb mentioned in the Induction. This tomb would thus be an incongruous setting during the scenes of the play itself. The other set (printed by Manly, p. 351) allows the supposition that Oberon and Bohun remained in the balcony throughout the play observing the action, since there is no hint that the two went off at the end of each interlude. If the tomb were actually so used in the former set of interludes (and this is doubtful), and if the gallery were the place of observation in the other set (and this is doubtful, too), the second set would make unnecessary an incongruous property. In neither *Faustus* nor *James IV*, however, is it at all certain that the versions showing incongruity represent the earlier form of production.

² *Jahrbuch*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 139 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 231.

meaningless location of scenes, so long will the plays seem chaotic and unintelligible. But as soon as they are considered from the point of view of the symbolic stage, there is hardly an extant play which does not in its staging become reasonable, coherent, and effective. The actual restoration of the Elizabethan stage is probably neither possible nor desirable; most modern audiences, seeing one of Shakespeare's plays presented as in his day, would in all probability be only confused and irritated. Perhaps the unset front stage may still prove advantageous in Shakespearean productions, but the old customs of scene-boards, sudden shifts of place within scenes, incongruous properties, etc., are probably lost forever. But, if lost to the stage, they are not necessarily lost to the closet, and as readers, if not as spectators, of the Elizabethan drama, we can still see it as it was and not as modern conditions make it appear to be.

I have in this discussion endeavored among minor matters to make clear the existence of scene-boards, the existence of three stage doors, and the probability of the existence of an alcove rear stage, though also insisting that no one form of stage was universal or exclusive. In more general topics I have attempted only to show that the advocates of alternation, in founding their speculations on too narrow a basis and on an as yet unproved, if not improbable, idea of stage-construction, are using tests contradictory to each other and sometimes certainly untrue; that, in consequence, the theory has been supposed to apply where it certainly does not, and its importance overemphasized; that Elizabethan stage custom, instead of being the simple, essentially modern thing the alternationists would make it, was a complex growth, uniting with some realistic methods elements of incongruity similar to, if not derived from, those of the mediæval stage; and that, if we would secure a proper idea of the Elizabethan drama, we must abandon our modern notions of stage propriety, and read the old plays from the point of view of the symbolic "incongruous" stage.

GEORGE F. REYNOLDS.

SHATTUCK SCHOOL,
Faribault, Minn.



REFERENCES TO DANTE IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH LITERATURE

Apparently no attempt has yet been made to estimate in detail the extent of the influence of Dante in seventeenth-century English literature, except, of course, for articles on Milton, and for such general and guarded statements as that of Professor Ker: "References to Dante are not frequent in this age [i. e., Dryden's]; there is little to note between Davenant's disrespectful mention of him in the preface to *Gondibert* and Gray's temperate appreciation."¹ It is the purpose of this article to gather some of the references and allusions to Dante from 1600 to 1700, as a contribution to the history of his fame in England, and as a means of testing the general impression that, apart from Milton, Dante was almost unknown, or at least as good as unknown, to the authors and poets of the age.

At the opening of the seventeenth century, a knowledge of Dante might have been secured in several ways, even by men unacquainted with Italian.² First in time and in importance was the well-known use of Dante by Chaucer, whose powerful translation of the Ugolino story and whose beautiful rendering of the "Hymn to the Virgin" are among the most striking proofs that Chaucer was not only, as is too often asserted, "the poet of birds and flowers and cheerful company," and hence incapable of being much influenced by the great Tuscan, but that he was also interested in tragedy and in spiritual and theological questions. Chaucer's followers, Gower and Lydgate, both mention Dante by name; and about 1416 two English bishops, Hallam and Bub-

¹ *Essays of Dryden*, ed. by W. P. Ker, Vol. I, p. 295.

² For the influence of Dante in the sixteenth century every student of the subject must be indebted to the admirable article of E. Koeppl in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, N. F., Vol. III (1890), pp. 428 ff., and to Paget Toynbee for his "English Translators of Dante (fourteenth to seventeenth centuries)," *Journal of Comparative Literature*, Vol. I, No. 4, pp. 345 f. Cf. also K. C. M. Sills, "Wyatt and Dante," in the same number of that journal, pp. 390-92. For the influence of Dante in England, cf. another article by Paget Toynbee, "The Earliest References to Dante in English Literature," *Miscellanea di studi critici edita in onore di Arturo Graf* (1903). The recently published book of Professor Kuhns, *Dante and the English Poets from Chaucer to Tennyson* (1904) is interesting for its treatment of Milton and of the nineteenth-century poets.

with, suggested to John of Serravalle his translation of the *Divina Commedia* into Latin prose, a copy of which probably reached England, as among the books in the library at Wells Cathedral, built by Bubwith, is mentioned a *Dantes translatus in carmen Latinum*.¹ There were also copies of Dante in the books given by Duke Humphrey to Oxford in 1443.² A little knowledge of Dante there must then have been in England during the fifteenth century.

In the next century, beginning with a mere citation of Dante's name by Alexander Barclay, the list of references grows, particularly, of course, after 1580, showing that in the last two decades the fame and the name of Dante were being more and more felt, though many of the allusions are by minor poets or by writers professionally interested in Italian subjects. The most interesting problems of this period—and problems which have by no means been as yet satisfactorily solved—concern Lyndsay's *Dreme*, Sackville's *Induction*, and Spenser. While it is hardly probable that Lyndsay knew the *Divine Comedy* directly, the *Dreme* yet contains so many striking reminiscences of Dante, such as Simon Magus and Bishop Caiphas "in caipis of bras,"³ as to suggest an intermediate source. On the other hand, the poetical progenitors of the *Induction* seem rather to have been the *Æneid*, particularly in Gawin Douglas' version,⁴ and possibly the opening of Lyndsay's *Dreme*. Too much stress, perhaps, has been laid on its general Dantesqueness. In the *Orpheus and Eurydice*⁵ of Robert Henryson (1508), for example, there are stanzas as much akin to Dante in setting and treatment as are those in the *Induction*; yet no one supposes that Henryson knew Dante.⁶ In the case of Spenser almost all of the evidence is nega-

¹ Cf. G. L. Hamilton in *Twentieth Annual Report of the Dante Society* (1901), p. 35.

² *Munimenta Academica*, ed. by H. Anstey (London, 1868), pp. 758, 771, 772; Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

³ Vs. 216. I know of no satisfactory treatment of the sources of the *Dreme*.

⁴ Courthope, *History of English Poetry*, Vol. II, p. 122. For verbal resemblances cf. Koepfel, *op. cit.*, pp. 437, 438.

⁵ Laing's *Early Popular Poetry of Scotland*, ed. by W. C. Hazlitt (1895), pp. 60, 61; cf. especially the stanza: "O dolly place and groundless depe dungeon." This suggestion I owe to Professor W. A. Neilson, of Columbia University.

⁶ On the other hand, Sackville certainly knew Italian and Italians; cf. a sonnet prefixed to Hoby's *Courtier* and *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, Vol. XLIII, p. 384.

tive. James Russell Lowell, to be sure, was an earnest advocate of Dante's influence, asserting that Spenser was the first English poet since Chaucer to read the *Divine Comedy*,¹ and marking in his own private copy of Spenser's works two passages as from Dante.² Yet, while Lowell's words should justly carry much weight, the parallels which he and others cite are far from conclusive. The most positive evidence for Spenser's knowledge of Dante, it might be said, lies in the fact that his friends, Gabriel Harvey³ and Sir Philip Sidney, knew Dante. Every direct proof fails. Nor is there as much reason for supposing that Shakespeare had the slightest acquaintance with his great Italian peer.⁴

Improbable as it is, then, that seventeenth-century writers could get knowledge of Dante from the important poets of the preceding age, it is nevertheless true that they could have found him in many of the lesser lights: in tributes to English poets by Leland, Bale, Churchyard, Meres; in translations from the Italian and in Italian grammars; in men like Puttenham and Harington and Greene; in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, where Dante has almost turned Protestant.⁵ Then, too, although the fact has been overlooked, the popular courtesy books of the time must have spread Dante's name; and such passages as those in the *Courtier*, translated by Sir Thomas Hoby, and in the *Galateo*, translated by Robert Peterson, which blamed Dante for lack of grace in diction and in

¹ *Essay on Dante*. Riverside edition, p. 207, note.

² *Faery Queen*, I, 2, 30, 31. Lowell's note reads, "Virgil, Dante," but Virgil is far closer; and *Faery Queen*, VI, 10, 6f. The note is, "All this is from Dante," but "An hundred naked maidens lilly white" is not of necessity Dantesque.

³ One of Harvey's allusions to Dante apparently escaped Professor Koepfel's notice. On the death of George Gascoigne, October 7, 1577, Harvey immediately began an elegy, in which he tells Gascoigne that in Hades he will meet Madame Beatrice, and well content he is that they should meet, for few "save those twoe," Dante and her, do thrive there. The lines read:

"Tis marvell if they have the nott
To Madame Beatrice belive
Well for this once I am content
A few there save those twoe do thrive."

It is an interesting allusion when we remember that Sidney also used Beatrice. The passage from Harvey may be found in *Letter Book of Gabriel Harvey*, ed. by E. J. L. Scott for the Camden Society (1884), pp. viii, ix, and 58.

⁴ In an article in *Anglia*, Vol. XVIII, p. 450, Karl Borinski compares honorificabilitudinitatibus (L. L. L. Act V, sc. 1) with the same word in Dante's *De Vulgari Eloquentia* II, cap. 7; but a reference to Murray's *New English Dictionary* will show that the word, in use even before Dante's time, is almost a stock example of the long compound.

⁵ In the edition of 1641 the Index reads: "Dante, an Italian writer against the Pope."

form, were doubtless of importance in helping to establish that standard of criticism that long led him to be regarded as inferior always to Petrarch, often to Tasso, Ariosto, and Sannazaro, and sometimes as in the same class with Marino. The popularity of these poets about the year 1600 is so well known, indeed, as to call for but little comment. If one is inclined to wonder at the paucity of references to Dante, the wonder is rather at their number when one remembers that not only in England, but in France,¹ and, to a certain extent, in Italy, Petrarch was still the master of the courtly style; the romantic epics of Ariosto and Tasso lent themselves far more readily to imitation than did the *Divine Comedy*; and the pastoral romance and the pastoral drama were yet so popular as to make it no marvel that the name of Alighieri should lag behind those of Sannazaro and Guarini.

Often indeed do the poets of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries refer to Italian writers, but seldom to Dante. Thus Bishop Hall mentions Petrarch, Poggio, Ariosto; William Browne, Ariosto, Tasso, Aretino; Giles Fletcher, Sannazaro; Phineas Fletcher, Ariosto, Guarini, Sannazaro, Tasso's *Aminta*; Habington and many more cite Petrarch's *Laura*; but Dante they cite not. His name seems utterly unknown to the group of religious poets as well, to Quarles and Crashaw and Herbert and Vaughan.

1. In Giles Fletcher's *Christ's Victorie and Triumph in Heaven and Earth* (1610), however, one passage bears such a striking resemblance in situation and tone to some of the best-known verses in the *Divine Comedy* as to call for particular comment. In *Christ's Victorie in Heaven*, Justice has just finished her speech urging "sentence on them condemn'd by their own lust,"² when

She ended, and the heav'nly Hierarchies
Burning in zeale, thickly imbranded weare;
Like to an armie that allarum cries,
And every one shakes his ydraded spear,

¹ To be sure, in France attempts had already been made to translate the *Divine Comedy*, and possibly, as Plumptre (Vol. II, p. 430, note) suggests, the version of Grangier (1596) may have made the *Commedia* familiar to Englishmen who read French, but not Italian.

² *The Complete Poems of Giles Fletcher*, ed. by A. B. Grosart (1876), p. 141.

And the Almighty's Selfe, as He would teare
The Earth and her firme basis quite in sunder,
Flamed all in iust revenge and mightie thunder.¹

The boldness of the figure, the dignity and power of the language, even though there is not verbal resemblance, must recall immediately to the readers of Dante the passage in the *Paradiso*² where, when St. Peter has finished his terrible arraignment of the popes, all the heaven blushes

E tal eclissi credo che in ciel fue,
Quando pati la Suprema Possanza.

The similarity of situation,³ the imaginative daring of the thought, are here so noteworthy as to justify ascribing to the possible influence of Dante what can probably never be definitely proved. Similarly the mystic vein of *Christ's Triumph after Death*,⁴ with its melody and dignity, particularly in the procession of patriarchs, prophets, martyrs, and saints, recalls Dante's description of the progress of the Church in the *Earthly Paradise*. Very possibly, then, the author of our first great English sacred poem may have known the sacred poem of Italy.

2. The evidence of any definite relations between John Donne and Dante seems to lie in the following somewhat doubtful allusion. In Satire IV, published in 1633, but written probably in youth, perhaps in 1597, Donne says:

At home, in wholesome solitariness,
My piteous soul began the wretchedness
Of suitors at court to mourn, and a trance
Like his, who dreamt he saw hell, did advance
Itself o'er me: such men as he saw there,
I saw at court, and worse, and more.⁵

Of course, several poets have fallen into trances and seen hell; but here the allusion seems by the context to point to Dante, particularly as elsewhere in the satire there are allusions to Italian subjects.⁶ Alexander Pope thought so, at any rate, for in his

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 142, stanza 40.

² Canto XXVII, ll. 28 ff.

³ There is no passage in the *Induction* where the boldness of the figure and the similarity of situation are so striking.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 229, stanzas 17 f.

⁵ *Poems of John Donne*, ed. by E. K. Chambers, Vol. II, p. 196, ll. 155 ff.

⁶ Ll. 48, 70, for example.

adaptation of the satire in 1735 he mentioned Dante's name, showing by that very fact perhaps that the knowledge of Dante had so extended during the century as to make the literary allusion here seem absolutely unquestionable.

A Vision Hermits can to Hell transport,
And forc'd e'en me to see the damn'd at court;
Not Dante, dreaming all the infernal state,
Beheld such scenes of envy, sin, and hate.¹

3. In the poetry of this period I have found two other passages referred to Dante, but on far from substantial grounds.

It is not necessary to go back, as some do, to the *Divine Comedy* for such a common Petrarchistic conceit as occurs in these lines of Habington's *Castara*:

Fix me on some bleak precipice
Where I ten thousand years may stand;
Made now a statue of ice,
Then by the summer scorcht and tan'd.²

4. Nor is the thought in Drummond:

But ah! what served it to be happy so
Sith pass'd pleasures double but new woe?³

necessarily to be ascribed to a recollection of Dante's story of Paolo and Francesca,⁴ although, of course, Drummond was so thoroughly at home in the Italian poets that the allusion is possible.

5. Coming now to actual citations, we find Dante's name in John Florio's Italian dictionary, *Queen Anna's New World of Words* (1611). In the preface to *A World of Words* (1598) Florio had given his judgment on the three great Italian poets: "Boccace is pretty hard, yet understood: Petrarche harder, but explained: Dante hardest, but commented;" yet in the list of authors consulted he omits Dante's name. In the 1611 edition, however, he includes Dante with an interesting list of commentators—Alessandro Velutelli, Bernardino Daniello, Giovanni Boc-

¹ *The Poetical Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. by George Gilfillan, Vol. I, p. 297.

² *Habington's Castara*, ed. by Charles A. Elton, p. 358. A note (p. 359) quotes *Inferno*, III, vs. 86.

³ *The Poems of William Drummond*, ed. by W. C. Ward, Vol. I, p. 87.

⁴ M. A. Scott, in *Pub. of the Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, Vol. XI (1896), p. 426. Several other interesting parallels are given. Cf. also Kuhns, *op. cit.*, p. 68, note.

caccio, and Landini. The dictionary had two more editions or revisions in this century, in 1659 and in 1688.

6. In 1615 Dante is mentioned by Robert Tofte in *The Blazon of Jealousie*, translated from Varchi's *Lettura della Gelosia*. The author renders three lines from one of Dante's "moral canzoni" (Canz. XIII, 1-3)¹ into pleasant doggerel, and in a gloss has some interesting biographical information to give about the Italian poet. Among other things, he says: "This Dant is by some learned Italians compared and equalled with Homer and Virgill, and was not alone a Poet, but a Philosopher, a Devine, a Phisition and an Astronomer with all: yet doth Cardinall Bembo preferre Petrarch before him."² The passage is of peculiar interest because, on the one hand, it is so definite in its praise and, on the other, because it cites Cardinal Bembo as one whose authority weighed much in the criticism of the day.

7. Another lover of Italian, Henry Reynolds, the translator in 1628 of Tasso's *Aminta*,³ names Dante, but only names him, in his *Mythomystes*, "wherein a short survey is taken of the nature and value of true Poesy and the depth of the Ancients above our modern poets," published about the year 1630. Payne Collier⁴ says that in various other places Reynolds shows himself to be acquainted with the works of Dante and the other Italian poets.

8. Of the rare references in the drama, one of the earliest occurs in the *Volpone* of Ben Jonson, 1605. Based, perhaps, on Florio's judgment, the passage gives an estimate of some of the better-known Italian poets, although it should not be taken for Jonson's own verdict, as the lines may be ironical:

Lady Would Be.

Which of your poets? Petrarch? or Tasso? or Dante?
Guarini? Ariosto? Aretine?
Cieco di Hadria? I have read them all . . .
Your Petrarch is more passionate, yet he,
In days of sonneting, trusted 'em with much.
Dante is hard, and few can understand him.
But for a desperate wit there's Aretine!⁵

¹ Toynbee, *op. cit.*, p. 363.

² Koepfel, *op. cit.*, pp. 452, 453.

³ M. A. Scott, *Pub. of the Mod. Lang. Assn.*, Vol. XI, p. 438.

⁴ *A Bibliographical and Critical Account of Early English Literature* (New York, 1866), Vol. II, p. 354.

⁵ Act III, sc. 2, ed. Cunningham, Vol. I, p. 365.

There seems no reason for thinking that the most learned of the dramatists ever tried to see if his judgment here was correct; at any rate, there is no apparent evidence of a study of Dante in his works.

9. Interesting likewise more for the grouping of the names than for any real criticism is a passage in humorous vein in *Love's Sacrifice* of John Ford (printed 1633). Mauruccio, the old antic, after making some absurd efforts at versifying in honor of his lady, bursts out:

O Giacopo, Petrarch was a dunce, Dante a jig-maker, Sanazzar a goose, Ariosto a puck-fist, to me! I tell thee, Giacopo, I am rapt with fury and have been for these six nights together drunk with the pure liquor of Helicon.¹

10. A really serious, though somewhat uncomplimentary, effort at a critical estimate of Dante occurs in Sir William Davenant's preface to *Gondibert*, dated from the Louvre in Paris, January 2, 1650. The passage, interesting throughout in its literary criticism, shows plainly the position to which men like the poet-laureate thought Dante should be relegated:

Tasso (who revived the heroic flame after it was for many years quenched) is held both in time and merit, the first of the moderns; an honor by which he gains not much, because the number he excels must needs be few which affords but one [i. e., Spenser] fit to succeed him: for I will yield to their opinion who permit not Ariosto, no not DuBar-tas, in this eminent rank of the heroicks rather than to make way by their admission for Dante, Marino, and others.²

The criticism means, of course, that in the opinion of the day Dante was a distinctly minor epic poet.

11. To the first half of the century belongs a work of an entirely different character, interesting as being perhaps one of the very few books that seem to reflect the *Vita Nuova*. The *Private Memoirs of Sir Kenelm Digby*, written at some place in Italy about 1628, have suggested to more than one reader, by the mysticism and dignity of the first few pages, a recollection of the mood and style of Dante in the *Vita Nuova*, although later

¹ Act II, sc. 1, ed. Gifford and Dyce, Vol. II, p. 30.

² *Works of the English Poets*, ed. by A. Chalmers, Vol. VI, p. 350.

on the work in style and tone shows itself more akin to Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*.

During the century Dante is used in some way or other by all the great prose writers except Bunyan.¹ Yet of these Sir Thomas Browne, Milton, and Dryden are the only ones to show conclusive evidence of having read the *Divine Comedy*; and of these, Milton alone is deeply influenced. The following citations, however, from the very fact that Dante is mentioned at all, point perhaps to a growing regard for his fame.

12. Robert Burton in his *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621) cites Dante twice; but in neither case does he show any evidence of having a first-hand acquaintance with his works. First he repeats one of the common anecdotes about the poet. "*Dante* that famous *Italian* Poet by reason his clothes were but mean could not be admitted to sit down at a feast."² Again, in writing of the center of the earth, he says: "Or is it the place of Hell, as Virgil in his *Æneid*, Plato, Lucian, Dante and others, poetically describe it, and as many of our Divines think?"³

13. The only quotation, so far as I know, in Jeremy Taylor, does not show absolutely that he read Dante, although the allusion is very aptly used. In discussing miracles, the divine says that they are the effect of divine power without the co-operation of nature,

or that I may use the elegant expression of Dante it was such

A cui natura

Non scaldò ferro mai ni batte ancude,⁴

for which nature never did heat the iron nor beat the anvil.⁵

14. But whether or not Burton or Taylor knew Dante, Sir

¹ Samuel Johnson called attention to the similarity between the beginning of the *Pilgrim's Progress* and the opening of the *Commedia*. Yet, as he says, there was no translation of Dante when Bunyan wrote (*Boswell's Life of Johnson*, Globe edition, p. 261). Zumbini, *Studi di letteratura straniera* (p. 16, note 17) cites some other parallels. Cf. also Kuhns, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

² Burton's *Anatomy*, ed. by A. R. Shilleto, Vol. I, p. 411. Burton has a note, *Gomesius lib. 3 c. 21 de sale*. There are several versions of the story; cf. Papanti, *Dante secondo la traduzione e i novellatori*, pp. 65, 130.

³ Vol. II, p. 45.

⁴ *Paradiso*, XXIV, 101, 102. It is interesting to note that Bossuet, *Histoire universelle* (Part. II, chap. 20), uses the same arguments that Dante here employs; but there is no apparent connection between Bossuet and Dante, nor between Jeremy Taylor and Bossuet.

⁵ "The Life of our Blessed Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," Discourse XIV, in *The Whole Works of Jeremy Taylor*, ed. by Reginald Heber (London, 1822), Vol. III, p. 106.

Thomas Browne is conspicuous for his literary use of material from the *Commedia*. Perhaps his acquaintance with the great poet dates back to his residence at Padua as a medical student, where he acquired a ready knowledge of Italian and may have drunk deep from Dante, the influence of whose "daring sublimity" is strongly marked in his later writings.¹ In the *Hydriotaphia* (1658) there are three citations from the *Divine Comedy*, all of which employ Dante's name. The first, "Dante's characters are to be found in skulls as well as faces,"² has the following gloss, which proves a close reading of the text:

The poet Dante, in his view of Purgatory found gluttons so meagre, and extenuated that he conceited them to have been in the siege of Jerusalem, and that it was easy to have discovered *Homo* or *Omo* in their faces: M being made by the two lines of their cheeks, arching over the eyebrows to the nose, and their sunk eyes making O O which makes up *OMO*.

Parean l'occhiaje anella senza gemme
Chi nel viso degli uomini legge OMO,
Bene avria quivi conoscivto l'emme.

—*Purgat.* XXIII., l. 31.³

A little further on in chap. iv, immediately following the far-famed passage on a dialogue between two infants in the womb, comes: "Pythagoras escapes in the fabulous hell of Dante among that swarm of philosophers wherein whilst we meet with Plato and Socrates, Cato is to be found in no lower place than Purgatory."⁴ On the next page is another allusion: "Meanwhile Epicurus lies deep in Dante's hell, wherein we meet with tombs enclosing souls which denied their immortalities."⁵ These passages in themselves are enough to prove that Browne was a close student of Dante.

15. About the same time, however, Thomas Fuller was displaying some ignorance of the very name of the poet, for in 1655, rendering in his *Church History* Leland's epigram on Chaucer⁶

¹ *Religio Medici and Other Essays by Sir Thomas Browne*, ed. by D. Lloyd Roberts (London, 1898), p. xii.

² *Sir Thomas Browne's Works*, ed. by Simon Wilkin (London, 1835), Vol. III, p. 480.

³ This passage is not in the *Religio Medici*, as Kuhns, *op. cit.*, p. 80, says, and as Plumptre (Vol. II, p. 430) had earlier remarked.

⁴ *Works*, Vol. III, p. 486. Browne's note reads: *Del Inferno*, cant. 4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 487.

⁶ *Praedicat Aligerum merito Florentia Dantem.*

into English verse, he writes: "Of Alger Dants Florence doth justly boast."¹ But in 1662, in the *Worthies*, under Sir Thomas Wyatt, he improves; for in versifying a similar epigram he says: "Let Florence for her Dantes justly boast."²

16. In 1662, another ecclesiastical writer, Edward Stillingfleet, the famous bishop of Worcester, in his *Origines Sacrae* renders several passages from the *Paradiso*, basing his version, however, on a Latin translation of the *Divine Comedy*, very probably, as Dr. Toynbee³ points out, that of John of Serravalle.

17. This is not the proper place to consider carefully Dante's influence on Milton as manifested by internal proof. Lowell's⁴ feeling that Milton's versification was mainly modeled on the Italian, especially on the *Divina Commedia*, is doubtless far-fetched. Many of the parallels given⁵ are also very puzzling. Yet some of the external evidence of Milton's knowledge of Dante is so conclusive that it is strange that it has been overlooked by most critics. That Milton took seriously to his study of Italian—a fact generally known—is proved by his letter to Benedetto Buonomattai, a Florentine, dated Florence, September 10, 1638, where he speaks of "retiring with avidity and delight to feast on Dante and Petrarch: nor," he goes on, "has Athens itself been able to confine me to the transparent wave of its Ilissus nor ancient Rome to the banks of its Tiber so as to prevent my visiting with delight the stream of the Arne and the hills of Faesolae."⁶ But it is not so widely asserted that Milton took almost a scholar's interest in his study of Dante—a fact which a close examination of his *Common-Place Book*⁷ shows. The entries, which for the most part are in Milton's own handwriting, are in English, French, Italian, and Latin, and are not so much

¹ *The Poems of Thomas Fuller*, ed. by A. B. Grosart, p. 129.

² *Ibid.*, 196.

³ Cf. his note in *Athenaeum*, November 30, 1901; also cf. *Journal of Comparative Literature*, Vol. I, No. 4, p. 364, note.

⁴ Letter dated September 24, 1889 (*Letters of Lowell to C. E. Norton*, Vol. II, p. 386).

⁵ Professor Kuhns, *op. cit.*, in his chapter on Milton has gathered many interesting parallels. For some corrections in his list see *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, Vol. XI, p. 328. For Milton's translation of Dante see Toynbee, *op. cit.*, p. 363.

⁶ *Prose Works*, ed. by J. A. St. John (London, 1878), Vol. III, p. 497. Dante and Petrarch are also named together in a letter dated April 21, 1647, from London to another Italian; *ibid.*, p. 502.

⁷ Printed in 1876 for the Camden Society.

abstracts as instances and conclusions, often in Milton's own words. Of the forty-seven references to Italian writers, eleven are from Machiavelli, eight from Dante—Dante thus standing second; and there is also one curiously minute reference to Boccaccio's *Life of Dante*. Of the eight references to Dante, four are from the *Inferno*, one from the *Purgatorio*, one from the *Paradiso*, one from the *Convivio*, and one to the *De Monarchia*.¹ These citations, with the quotation of the lines on Constantine in the *Reformation in England*, the allusion to Dante's *Casella* in the sonnet to Mr. H. Lawes, and the reminiscences from St. Peter's invective in the *Paradiso* in *Lycidas*, show a pretty wide reading in Dante. The references in the *Common-Place Book*, moreover, indicate sometimes a close study not only of the text, but of the context. In a reference on usury (p. 160) there is a complete understanding of a rather difficult passage:

Usuram peccare in naturam, et in artem ait *Dantes*; in naturam quia facit ut nummi pariant nummos qui est partus non naturalis: in artem quia non laborat.

The reference is to the complicated discussion of usury at the close of the eleventh² canto of the *Inferno*; and Milton's additional note, "Daniell in eum locum," refers very probably to the commentary of Bernardino Daniello (1568) mentioned by John Florio. Another erudite reference is that under the title *Rex* (p. 182), where Milton says:

Authoritatem regiam a Papâ non dependere scripsit *Dantes* Florentinus in eo libro cui est titulo *Monarchia* quem librum Cardinalis del Poggietto tanquam scriptum haereticum comburi curavit, ut testatur *Boccatius* in vita *Dantis* editione priore, nam e posteriore mentio istius rei omnis est deleta ab inquisitore.

The facts are here taken from Boccaccio's *Vita di Dante*, chap. xvi; but in Marci Leone's edition of the *Vita* there is no reference to confirm the last part of Milton's statement.³ Yet another indication of Milton's interest in Dante may be seen in a passage

¹ The references in the *Common-Place Book* are pp. 12, 16, 70, 111, 160, 182, 191, (197).

² And not to Canto ii, as in the Camden Society Report; cf. the passage in the reprint of the *Common-Place Book* for the Royal Society of Literature.

³ The editions of the *Vita* are: Venice, 1477, with the first Venetian edition of the *Divine Comedy*; Rome, separately in 1544, and with the *Vita Nuova* in 1576. See Boccaccio's *Life of Dante*, translated by G. R. Carpenter for the Grolier Club (New York, 1900), Introduction, p. 10.

from his treatise on *Education*, where in discussing the importance of poetry, he writes that he means

that sublime art which in Aristotle's poetics, in Horace, and the Italian commentators of Castelvetro, Tasso, Mazzoni, and others, teaches what the laws are of a true epic poem, what of a dramatic, what of a lyric what decorum is, which is the grand masterpiece to observe.¹

The allusion to Mazzoni refers to *La Difesa di Dante* (1573),² a critical work which was the fruit of the famous literary controversy over Dante in Italy in the second half of the sixteenth century.³

Such passages as these, showing careful study, and here and there scholarly exactness,⁴ are proofs of what is so often asserted in general terms, that Milton had a definite, first-hand knowledge of Dante; that he had read, marked, learned, and in places inwardly digested the works of the great Italian.

18. Additional evidence of Milton's love of Dante is found in the writings of his nephew, Edward Phillips, who, we know, was under the instruction of his famous uncle, and that, too, shortly after Milton's return from Italy. While perhaps it is not fair to the younger man to ascribe to the poet all the acute criticisms found in Phillips' work, no doubt Milton had a hand in the preparation of a short history of poetry written in Latin under this title: *Tractatulus de carmine Dramatico Poetarum prae-sertim in choris tragicis et veteris Comoediae. Compendiosa enumeratio Poetarum (saltem quorum fama maxime enituit) qui a tempore Dantis Aligerii usque ad hanc aetatem claruerunt:*

¹ *Prose Works*, ed. by J. A. St. John (London, 1878), Vol. III, p. 473.

² Spingarn, *Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, p. 124, note.

³ In the *Nova Solyma*, ed. by Rev. Walter Begley, 1902 (Vol. II, pp. 35, 36), there is a discussion of sin as being high treason against God: and "Adam's fall treated as inferring forfeiture to his posterity because of its character as high treason" (see George Neilson, *Scottish Historical Review* Vol. II, No. 6, p. 204, who also compares *Paradise Lost*, III, 200-10). The legal doctrine of sin here set forth may owe something to Dante, who conceives of Lucifer as the arch traitor, and who in *Paradiso*, VII, l. 79, speaks of sin as disfranchising human nature. At any rate, a careful consideration of the theological passages in the *Nova Solyma* with reference to Dante would be interesting, and might possibly throw light on the question of its authorship.

⁴ Another excellent illustration is in the passage (p. 191) on *Nobilitas*, where Milton cites "Dante Florentinus optime tractat de vera nobilitate, canzon 4," evidently referring to *Conv. IV, Canz. iii*; and then adds, "See Chaucer, Wife of Bath's Tale, fol. 36, and Romant of the Rose, fol. 118," alluding to the passage "Wife of Bath's Tale" (ll. 1109-99, especially ll. 1119, 1120), in which passage l. 1125, "The wise poete of Florence That highte Dant," is named.

*nempe Italarum, Germanorum, Anglorum.*¹ In the work itself there is this reference to Dante:

Libet igitur initium facere a *Dante Aligerio* Florentino Poeta celeberrimo, & quasi Principe Antipilano Italarum qui vulgari Idiomate bene scripserunt carmina; famâ notissimum ejus operum quae extant sive Prosaica, sive Metrica Oratione est Poema ejus quod inscribitur *Paradisus*, cui adduntur *Purgatorium* & *Infernum*; floruit Anno Domini 1321. Imperante tunc temporis in Germania Ludovico quinto Bavaro.²

To imply, as Phillips certainly seems to imply here, that the *Paradiso* is the most important part of the *Divine Comedy*, is unusually acute criticism, and seems in itself an indication of Milton's part in the little treatise. It is so common to find the *Inferno* in the place of honor that the precedence of the *Paradiso* here and in the following extract is worth notice. In the *Theatrum Poetarum* itself (published 1675, licensed September 14, 1674), there is in the list of modern poets a short account of Dante, a mere adaptation of the earlier notice.

Dantes Aligerus, a most renowned Florentine, and the first of Italian poets of any Fame or Note for Vernacular Verse, but that which most proclaims his Fame to the World is his Triple Poem Entitled *Paradice*, *Purgatory* and *Hell*; besides which he wrote several things in Prose: the Meridian of his flourishing time was the year 1321, the Emperour Lewis the 5th surnamed Bavarus then ruling.³

In the last quarter of the century Dante became known in England by means of French criticism. Something about him could be found in Rapin's *Reflexions sur la poetique* (1674), translated into English by Rymer the same year. In Baillet's *Jugemens des savans* (1685) the list of modern poets *depuis la renaissance des Lettres* begins with a four-page account of Dante, wherein is the following tribute:

On a coutume de mettre Dante à la tête de tous les Ecrivains Italiens, au préjudice même de son maître Brunetto Latini, soit parce qu'il est un des premiers qui se soient appliqués à défricher la Langue du Pays ou du moins à endémeler les beautés, soit parce qu'on le considère comme la Maître de Petrarque.⁴

¹ *Theatrum Poetarum*, ed. by Sir S. Egerton Brydges (1800), Introduction.

² Transcribed from the eighteenth edition of Buchler's *Thesaurus* (London, 1679), p. 383. For a copy of this transcription and for other valuable assistance I am indebted to Professor J. E. Spingarn, of Columbia University.

³ *Theatrum Poetarum* (1674), "The Modern Poets," p. 30.

⁴ Paris, 1722, edition, Vol. IV, p. 265.

There was also information on Dante in the *Dictionnaire historique et critique* of Pierre Bayle (published in 1696, and translated into English in 1710).

19. In English the sort of information current about Dante is well illustrated by Thomas Pope Blount's *Censura celebriorum authorum* (1690; imprimatur May 31, 1690); revised 1694 and 1710, in an edition, printed at Geneva, which renders French, English and Italian criticisms into Latin. In the account of Dante¹ the list of works reads as follows:

Comoediarum liber I, De Monarchia Mundi lib. I, Epistolae plures, Disputatio de aquâ et terrâ, Carmina de Inferno, Purgatorio, Paradiso Italicè conscripta, Libellus de amore, Cantica viginti, Italico sermone composita, Libellus de Officio Pontificis et Cesaris Romani, De vulgari eloquentiâ libri duo, cum tamen quatuor se daturum polliceatur, sed hoc consilium mors ejus interrupit.²

Blount gives several quotations from writers who had spoken of Dante, including extracts from Petrarch, Boccaccio, Boissard, and Baillet, the verses on Dante's tomb at Ravenna ascribed to Bembo, the father of the cardinal, and Dante's own supposed epitaph. The most noteworthy bit of criticism is from Rapin:

Le P. Rapin dit que les pensées de ce Poete sont presque toujours si abstraites & si difficiles qu'il n'y a de l'art à les penetrer; que Dante n'a pas assez de feu; que pour l'ordinaire il n'est pas assez modeste qu'il a esté trop hardi d'invoquer son propre esprit pour sa Divinité."³

The quotation impressed Blount, for in his *De re poetica* (1694) he cites it: "Rapin says 'Dantes Algerus wanted fire' "⁴—surely not one of the least wonderful of the many wonderful verdicts of the pseudo-classicists.

20. Rymer, who had in 1674 come across Dante's name in his translation of Rapin's *Reflexions sur la poetique*, mentions Dante twice in his *Short View of Tragedy* (1693). In speaking of Chaucer's service to English literature, he mentions the Italian as follows:

But tho' the Italian reformation was begun and finished well nigh at

¹ 1690 edition, pp. 297 ff.; 1694 edition, pp. 421 ff.

² The list shows that here Blount was badly muddled. The *Convivio* is omitted altogether, the *De monarchia* is evidently referred to twice, and *Liber comoediarum* implies that Dante was a dramatist and a comic dramatist.

³ 1690 edition, p. 298.

⁴ P. 58.

the same time by Boccace, Dante, and Petrarche. Our language retain'd something of the churl; something of the stiff and Gothish did stick upon it, till long after Chaucer.¹

The second allusion is much more interesting, not only because it is a typical pseudo-classical criticism, but because it shows by the aptness of quotation that Rymer had probably read Dante. In his discussion of *Julius Cæsar*, dwelling on Shakespeare's faulty art in making his Brutus inconsistent with the Brutus of history, he commends some of the earlier speeches, and then says that elsewhere Shakespeare makes his character no better than a son of a butcher.

But when Shakespeare's own blundering Maggot of self-contradiction works, then must Brutus cry out:

Stoop, Romans, stoop,
And let us bathe our hands in Cæsar's blood
Up to the elbows . . .

Had this been spoken by some king of France, we might rememeber Villon . . . and what Dante has recorded:

Chiamato fui di la 'Ugo ciapetta
Di me son Nati, Philippi e Loigi,
Per mi novellamente e' Francia retta
Figlivol fui d'un Beccaio di Parigi.²

21. Wotton, in his *Reflections on Ancient and Modern Learning*, mentions Dante;³ but evidently as an afterthought, for there is no allusion in the first edition of 1694.

22. The great poet, the date of whose death closes the century, has at least four references to Dante; and it is interesting to note that three of these are concerned with the refinement of the language and of the times. In the "Epistle to the Earl of Roscommon" on his excellent *Essay on Translated Verse* (1680), Dryden writes:

And Dante's polished page
Restor'd a silver not a golden age.⁴

The preface to *Albion and Albanus, An Opera* (1685) contains in its noteworthy tribute to the Italian tongue the following general reference:

¹ P. 78.

² P. 150. The reference is to *Purgatorio*, XX, 49-52, where Hugh Capet is speaking.

³ Third edition (1705), p. 25.

⁴ *The Poetical Works of John Dryden* (London, 1851), p. 142.

This language has in a manner been refined and purified from the Gothic ever since the time of Dante, which is above four hundred years ago.¹

And in the preface to the *Fables* (1700) Dryden, speaking of the analogous position of Chaucer and Boccaccio in literature, dwells again on the refining power of Dante:

He and Chaucer, among other things, had this in common, that they refined their mother tongues; but with this difference, that Dante had begun to file their language, at least in verse, before the time of Boccace, who likewise received no little help from his master, Petrarch.²

A passage in the dedication of the *Æneis* (1697) is much more specific, and perhaps indicates a first-hand acquaintance with Dante on Dryden's part. Speaking of Julius Cæsar, the author says:

He being murdered by his own son, whom I neither dare commend, nor can justly blame (though Dante, in his *Inferno*, has put him and Cassius, and Judas Iscariot betwixt them, into the great Devil's mouth)³

Dante must then have been more than a mere name to Dryden.

As the names from Florio and Ben Jonson to Wotton and Dryden are passed in review, the list, which does not claim to be complete, suggests that the general feeling that seventeenth-century England was not much affected by Dante is not far from wrong. Certainly criticism had by no means placed the poet where he stands a century later. On the whole, the opinion which the period held of him is not very different from that advanced in a curious bit of eighteenth-century criticism, "The Balance of the Poets," published in *Dodsley's Museum* and ascribed to Mark Akenside. There in a table of values of the various poets Shakespeare and Homer have 18; Milton, 17; Virgil, 16; Spenser, Molière, Cervantes, Corneille, 14; and, along with Sophocles, Ariosto, Horace, Pindar, Pope, and Racine, Dante gets 13.⁴ Roughly speaking, Dante was to the seventeenth century a person of no large importance, although his fame as one of the greater poets certainly grows during the century; and by 1709 it

¹ *Essays of John Dryden*, ed. by W. P. Ker, Vol. I, p. 274.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 248.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 169. Professor Ker (p. 295) does not believe the reference to Cato on p. 170 is due to Dante but to Montaigne.

⁴ Charles Bucke, *Life of Akenside* (London, 1832), p. 99.

is not surprising to find him in William King's *Art of Love* grouped with Homer, Virgil, and Chaucer.¹ Yet, while more and more Dante is being accounted a poet whom men should know by name, as men today cite Homer, for example, it cannot be said that he exercised any great literary influence in the century. Of the important poets, only Milton was indubitably under the sway of his poetic power. The great prose writers, Sir Thomas Browne, Jeremy Taylor, and Dryden, it is true, may all have been acquainted with the *Divine Comedy* at first-hand; but Milton and Browne alone used its material for important literary purposes. As for the reason for men not reading Dante more, it can only be said that the spirit of their age worked against their caring to know him. At the opening of the century other Italians overshadowed his fame; a little later Italian literature seems to have been held in waning esteem.² Moreover, by 1650, as Davenant's criticism shows, poets had set up a fixed and rigid standard for measuring the epic; and that standard would not include Dante as a safe model any more than pseudo-classical dramatic criticism would hold up Shakespeare as a safe model. If men had known Dante, they might have thought differently; but the point is that they were not interested, as the late eighteenth century became interested, in the kind of thing Dante's imagination represents and emphasizes. If they had been so interested, as Milton shows, they would have found and used Dante.

¹ *The Original Works of William King* (London, 1776), Vol. III. p. 142.

² For example, Howell, *Instructions for Forreine Travell* (1642), omits to mention any contemporary or other Italian authors, although he gives a list of French and Spanish writers that "will afford excellent entertainment" (*Arber Reprint*, pp. 25, 39). A half-century earlier a writer would have been more inclined to leave out mention of French and Spanish poets.

KENNETH C. M. SILLS.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

"MAÎTRE PATELIN" IN THE GOTHIC EDITIONS BY
PIERRE LEVET AND GERMAIN BENEAUT

Among a score of editions of the farce of *Patelin*, the Bibliothèque Nationale possesses two of great value and extraordinary interest, not merely to those who are concerning themselves with the history of printing in its infancy, but also to those who recognize the need of more accurate knowledge of the text of *Patelin*; for thus far no one has attempted to write a thoroughly scientific bibliography of this excellent and ever-youthful comedy.¹ Yet no one can hope to offer a critical text until the bibliographical work has been satisfactorily completed. We must, therefore, ascertain with all possible accuracy the age and other essential characteristics of every manuscript or printed book in which the text of *Patelin* has been handed down, but first of all we turn to the fifteenth century.

About 1485, at any rate not later than 1488, hardly a score of years after a grant of pardon,² issued by Louis XI, had recorded the existence and popularity of our farce, Guillaume Le Roy printed at Lyons what is probably the first edition of *Patelin*.³

¹The bibliography in the late Petit de Julleville's *Répertoire du théâtre comique en France au Moyen-Âge* (Paris, 1886), though extremely useful, is incomplete and contains several mistakes. For instance, on p. 194 he catalogues the humbug facsimile of Levet's edition in the "Bibliothèque gothique" as if it were two different books, and he obviously was quite unaware that the *Patelin* of the "Bibliothèque gothique" is not only not a facsimile, but also not even an honest attempt to reproduce in modern Gothic type, etc., the woodcuts and the text of Pierre Levet. How anyone who had ever looked at genuine Gothic letter could have taken this clumsy imposture for a facsimile passes understanding. Baillien's *Patelin* in the "Édition gothique" deserves to be blacklisted as a *supercherie typographique et littéraire*.

²Printed in the "Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes," second series, Vol. IV, p. 259.

³The *Livre des saints anges*, dated 1486, is commonly believed to be the last book printed by Guillaume Le Roy, but see n. 2, p. 125. Exactly the same font of type as was used for this book appears in the *Patelin*. From the exemplar of the *Livre des saints anges* preserved at the Bibliothèque Nationale (D 1583) I copied the colophon, which runs as follows: Cy finist le livre des saints anges Imprime a lyon par mal || stre guillaume le roy. le xx iour du mois de may. Lan de grace Mil || cccc. lxxxvi. Of course, there exists no absolute proof that Le Roy's *Patelin* is the first edition, but it is rather unlikely that the farce had been printed before so early a date as 1485. This is the year considered most probable by Mr. Émile Picot; Mr. Anatole Claudin, who believes Le Roy's edition to be the first, holds the opinion quoted in n. 1, p. 122. As it was through a clue given me by Mr. Claudin that I found the only extant exemplar known of this edition, I avail myself of this opportunity to say how well his cour-

Le Roy's source is unknown. The only manuscript¹ of *Patelin* that incontestably belongs to the fifteenth century differs too widely and too often from Le Roy's edition to have served as a model to be followed by Le Roy, or by whoever set the type for his edition, if the typesetting was faithfully done; but Le Roy's text was destined, within five years at most, to be accurately copied and preserved in the two editions² already mentioned as owned by the Bibliothèque Nationale.

What reason have we for assuming that Le Roy's *Patelin* is so closely akin to Levet and Beneaut? May not one or several editions now lost have intervened? This may be true; but whoever compares either Levet or Beneaut with Le Roy cannot fail to conclude that Le Roy is the direct ancestor of both,³ even though one generation or more may have intervened. My own conviction, based on a word-by-word comparison of the three texts, is that either Levet or Beneaut copied Le Roy's *Patelin*, and copied with a loyalty rare indeed in that fifteenth century when printers of chapbooks, if not of more ambitious works, seldom corrected their proofs with care, or even conscientiously followed the manuscript or printed text before their eyes.

Now, if Le Roy's edition is the source of the editions by Levet and Beneaut, did each copy his text independently? Or, on the other hand, was Levet copied by Beneaut, or Beneaut by Levet? There is not one chance in a million that Levet and Beneaut independently copied Le Roy. But the evidences that Beneaut copied Levet, or that Levet copied Beneaut, are overwhelming.

tesy and knowledge availed me. I am equally indebted to the well-known bookseller, Mr. Edouard Rahir, and to Mr. A. Rosset, who gave himself the trouble to return from his country seat to Lyons in order that he might send his treasure to me at Paris.

¹Kept at the Bibliothèque Nationale and catalogued thus: "Ms. fr., Nouv. acq. 4723." Of this manuscript, which lacks vss. 1-226, 654-56, 1357-1406, and 1581-99, I hope to give a full description at an early date.

²Levet's *Patelin* is catalogued "Réserve, Ye 243"; Beneaut's is "Réserve, Ye 237." I have accurate copies of these editions.

³The similarity is so great that Le Roy hardly offers a score of important variants; the differences are due mainly to the ordinary changes in spelling made by uncritical printers. Mr. Claudin devotes pp. 29-112 in Vol. III of his splendid work to Le Roy. On p. 89 he reproduces in facsimile two pages of Le Roy's *Patelin*. Elsewhere I shall describe this edition at length, showing how it is related to MS 4723, *nouv. acq.*, and why it deserves to be considered the standard text. Yet it seems to me now that Mr. Claudin somewhat overrates the superiority of Le Roy's edition to those of his immediate followers.

Before I attempt to demonstrate which copied the other, it will be necessary to prove that the copying was actually done. A short description of each edition will supply the proof. We may begin with Levet.

The copy of Levet's *Patelin* in the Bibliothèque Nationale is supposed to be the only one in existence. It is in perfect condition, containing no false leaves and no restorations. Time has somewhat yellowed its pages, but not one is marred or torn, and the print is seldom blurred or broken, though the ink has probably lost some of its blackness, having been laid on thinner than in the edition by Beneaut. On the title-page, over Levet's well-known device,¹ occur these words: *Maistre pierre pathelin*. On p. 3, signed a. ii., is a woodcut showing Patelin in parley with Guillemette; then comes the *incipit*, to wit, *Maistre pierre commence*; then come five verses. There are eighty-two pages in all, with signatures as follows: a to d by sixteen, e by twelve, f by five. Levet's *Patelin* like Beneaut's, contains 1,599 verses,² normally octosyllabic, and in both editions one is struck by the omission of the second hemistich of vs. 1530, *Or n'en croyez rien*—a telltale feature of great importance when we seek to establish the genealogy of later editions. As vss. 1502-40 are all counterfeit in Le Roy's *Patelin*, it is, of course, impossible to say whether his edition omitted these words or not. Levet's *Patelin* is paged precisely like Beneaut's, and both editions are alike in size and general style; the type is similar, but not identical. On the whole, Levet's work is better than Beneaut's: fewer letters are blurred or broken, capitals are employed more consistently, and there are not so many misprints as in Beneaut. Levet's illustrative woodcuts are placed exactly like Beneaut's.

Beneaut's *Patelin* is also the only copy known. It is in excellent condition, though the margins are in a few places a little torn; but not a leaf has been lost or inserted, and the text has not been tampered with. My reason for mentioning here the condi-

¹A white heart, point down, surmounted by a white cross. Inside the heart is the monogram PL. The whole figure stands out on a black background, and round it is a square frame, white, with geometric decorative figures. Levet used this device in his *Villon* (1489), but it appears in other works of still earlier date. Mr. Claudin reproduces it in facsimile in his *Histoire de l'imprimerie en France*, Vol. I, p. 439.

²The odd number is due to the fact that three verses have a single rime.

tion of each of these editions is, of course, that my argument may rest on a firm basis.

On p. 1¹ of Beneaut's *Patelin* are the words *Pathelin le grant et le petit*. Now, what is the meaning of this odd title? In the colophon of his undated edition of *Patelin* and its two sequels,² Jehan Bonfons (fl. c. 1547-1568) says, *Cy fine le grant Maistre Pierre Pa || thelin*. Hence Beneaut's puzzling title may mean that he printed one of the sequels; yet another conjecture, not wholly new, seems more convincing. Here it is: In 1489 Levet published *Le grant testament Villon, & le petit*,³ of which an exemplar is preserved at the Bibliothèque Nationale bound under one cover with Beneaut's *Patelin*.⁴ But Beneaut also published a *Villon*,⁵ though one year later than Levet, and it is doubtless to Beneaut's *Le grant testament villon & le petit* that the words *le grant et le petit* on the title-page of Beneaut's *Patelin* refer. It is pretty certain that Beneaut's *Patelin* and his *Villon* were sold together, as is suggested by the dates and by the double, partially abbreviated, title which Beneaut employs on the first page of his edition of *Patelin*. This difference between the two editions of *Patelin* by Levet and by Beneaut is striking, but it of course does not imply any real differences between their texts. Nor is it good evidence that Beneaut and Levet were allied in business, though such seems to have been to some extent the case.⁶

¹ So far as I know, no fifteenth-century book has numbered pages. Signatures alone were employed, but they were often omitted. My numbering is merely for the sake of convenience.

² The *Nouveau Pathelin* and the *Testament Pathelin*.

³ *Le grant testament Villon, & le petit || Son codicille. Le iargon & ses balades* [Levet's device]. The colophon reads thus: *Cy finist le grant testament || maistre francois villon. Son || codicille, ses ballades & largü || Et le petit testament. Impri || me a paris lan mil. CCCC. qua || tre vings et neuf.*

⁴ Petit de Julleville's conjecture (*Rép.*, p. 191, footnote) as to a possible interpretation of this fact need not be taken more seriously than he himself takes it. The "singulière coïncidence" is quite as likely to be due to the fact that "*Patelin*" and *Villon* were both in fashion. Following out Petit de Julleville's implied theory, we might attribute *Patelin* to Guillaume Alexis.

⁵ *Le grant testament villon & le petit. son codicille, le largü & ses balades*. With this colophon: *Cy finist le grant testament maistre francois villon son codicille ses ballades & largü Et le petit testament Imprime a paris par germain bineaut Imprimeur demourant au saumont devant le paillois lan mil IIII C quatre vings & dix*. Notice that all the title and the whole colophon through the word *paris* in Beneaut's *Villon* are identical with the corresponding parts in Levet's *Villon*. The resemblance is due, no doubt, to the fact that Beneaut copied Levet. Is it not likely that Beneaut followed the same course in the same year by copying Levet's *Patelin*?

⁶ See Claudin's chapters on Levet and Beneaut in his *Histoire de l'imprimerie en France*.

Beneaut used two of the woodcuts in Levet's *Villon* to adorn his *Patelin*. These cuts' represent "la grosse Margot" (also "la belle heaulmiere") and Villon. In other words, we have here merely a couple of stock illustrations or *passepourtout*, and they are quite vague enough to pass for Patelin and for Guillemette as well as for François Villon and the two strumpets whose ways he sings.

Levet's cut of Villon portrays Patelin on p. 3 of Beneaut's edition. Beneath it are the words, *Maistre pierre commence*, followed by five verses, precisely as in the *Patelin* of Levet. As in Levet, there are eighty-two pages in all, including the title-page, which I have, for convenience, numbered 1. In Le Roy's *Patelin*, on the other hand, there were originally eighty-eight pages and no illustrations. But I should call attention to the following identical peculiarities to be found in Levet and Beneaut, but not in their indubitable prototype, Le Roy: (The features to be noted are indicated by italics.)

Vs. 17 homme plus saige fort le maire

[Le Roy has *fors*]

Vs. 52 tenu lune des *sages* testes

[Le Roy has *chaudes*]

Vs. 60 qui dient qui sont *auocas*

[Le Roy has *quiltz dient qui sont aduocas.*]

Vs. 82 Ce sont *ne sont mie*

[Le Roy rightly omits *ne sont mie*, which reading merely spoils the verse by making it contain twelve syllables.]

Vs. 204 que ceulx donc vous deues retraire

[Le Roy has *dont.*]

Vs. 386 ie vous donne *ceste yeil* a traire

[Le Roy has *cest oeil.*]

Vs. 444 penca *aluy* comment lauray *le*

[Le Roy has penca *a luy* comment lauraige.]

Finally, both leave space enough for about six lines at the bottom of p. 50 (signed d. ii.) under vs. 1006 (*asses drap pour faire des robbes*), yet nothing is really omitted.

Blunders or oddities such as these are unlikely to have been

In Vol. I, p. 443, he says: "Levet parait s'être associé temporairement avec cet imprimeur [Beneaut] pour la mise au jour d'une édition des *Croniques des roys de France.*"

¹ For facsimiles see Claudin, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 440.

independently copied by Levet and Beneaut from an edition now lost, no matter how closely imitative the two typesetters of these parts of their editions may have been: we should of course expect to find a certain number of variations from the text of Le Roy; for the printers of fifteenth-century chapbooks were generally not only slavish in copying what was wrong, but also inaccurate in reproducing what was right. The fidelity shown by these three books is remarkable. It was the early sixteenth-century printers who first wofully mangled or modernized the text of *Patelin*.

The features that I have now pointed out—to wit, the extraordinary similarity of make-up and text in these two editions—seem to demonstrate beyond question either that Beneaut copied Levet's *Patelin*, or that Levet copied the *Patelin* of Beneaut. Excellent scholars, men versed not only in literary knowledge, but also in the history of printing, have held both opinions. Some are sure that Beneaut copied Levet; others state that Levet copied Beneaut.¹ Often no reason has been given for holding one or the other opinion; often the woodcuts have been called to witness,² or other facts and fancies have been brought into play to prove either that Levet copied Beneaut or that Beneaut copied Levet. Is it possible to ascertain the truth?

So far as external evidence³ is concerned, we have, I think, only one fairly significant fact: The type used by Levet for his *Patelin* is the same as he used for his *Villon* in 1489, and appears,

¹ Among others, Mr. Claudin himself, in a letter dated July 23, 1904, writes as follows: "The best text [of *Patelin*] is the text of what I think is the first edition printed at Lyons with the types of Guillaume Le Roy, without date, but certainly before the edition of Paris, 1490, G. Bineault, or the edition of Pierre Levet without date, but published after the edition of Bineault, on account of the same cuts appearing with broken lines." That the cuts are not the same will be evident to whoever examines them closely or reads pp. 123 and 124 of the present article and n. 2, pp. 123 and 124.

² In Vol. II, p. 304, of his *Histoire*, etc., Mr. Claudin writes: "On trouve, dans ce livre [i. e., in Beneaut's *Patelin*], des figures sur bois: ce sont les mêmes illustrations que celles de l'édition [of *Patelin*] que Pierre Levet avait publiée l'année précédente en même temps que le *Grand Testament de Villon*." What warrant the eminent scholar has for declaring so positively that Levet published his *Patelin* in 1489, I do not know. Hardly anything stronger than an inference seems warranted by the facts. In Vol. I, p. 443, *op. cit.*, Mr. Claudin had, indeed, made a much more conservative statement; for he says: "Ce livre [Levet's *Patelin*] ne porte pas de date, mais il a dû paraître vers la même époque que le *Grand Testament de Villon* [1489]." But both these statements are contradicted by that quoted in n. 1, p. 122.

³ By "external evidence" I mean all evidence not derived from the two editions of *Patelin* by Levet and Beneaut.

Vous feries bien de la tendre

Le iuge

He dea ie ailleurs a entendre

se vostre partie est presente

deliures vous sans plus d'attente

et nestes vous pas demandeur

Le diappier

Si suis



Pierre Levet's woodcut of the court scene in *Patelin*. Reproduced from the original by permission of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

or reappears, in good condition in his *Patelin*. This may be called "evidence," but it would hardly pass muster in court.

The internal evidence, which is infinitely more substantial, is of two kinds: first, the dimensions and condition of the two woodcuts which both editions seem to have in common; second, the text.

In Beneaut's *Patelin* two woodcuts,¹ apparently, but not really, identical, illustrate the court scene. In Levet's *Patelin* the court scene is illustrated by a woodcut apparently the same as those in Beneaut, but a close examination, even with the naked eye, reveals not only that the two cuts in Beneaut are not exactly alike, but also that the cut in Levet differs in several respects from either of the two cuts in Beneaut. Not only is the Judge distinctly and strikingly cross-eyed in both Beneaut's cuts, whereas he is looking along parallel lines in Levet, but a dozen other characteristics prove that Levet's block was not used in Beneaut's press, and we can say without hesitation that Levet did not use, in printing his *Patelin*, either of the blocks employed by Beneaut.²

¹For a facsimile of one of the two cuts of the court scene in Beneaut's *Patelin*, see Claudin, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 304. So far as I am aware, no facsimile of Levet's cut of the court scene has ever been published. But Mr. Léopold Delisle has granted me permission to have facsimiles made of all the woodcuts in Levet's *Patelin*, and within a comparatively short time they will be published, either in my edition of *Patelin* or in some other accessible volume.

²Mr. Claudin, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 440, says: "Les bois de Pierre Levet n'ont été employés que par lui et ne sortaient pas de son atelier." Very likely this statement is quite true, yet it hardly seems to agree with the following remark on p. 443, *ibid.*: "Les illustrations de *Maître Pierre Pathelin* [in Levet's edition] reparaissent, avec des cassures dans les filets, dans une autre édition datée du 20 décembre 1490 et sortie des presses de Germain Beneaut ou Bineault, . . ." That this is not true has already been said in n. 1, p. 122, where the evidence is indicated. See also n. 1, p. 124.

The following table of dimensions and the comparative description beneath should do away with all doubt. (The figures indicate centimeters.)

	Beneaut No. 6	Levet No. 5	Beneaut No. 7
Left border.....	9.80	9.95	9.95
Right border.....	9.90	9.95	10.20
Upper border.....	6.15	6.25	6.30
Lower border.....	6.15	6.15	6.20
Diagonal.....	11.60	11.70	11.77
Diagonal.....	11.60	11.65	11.79
From the sole of Patelin's shoe to the highest point of the Judge's chair.....	9.87	9.25	9.31

Thus Levet's woodcut has about the same dimensions as those in Beneaut's edition, but it will be seen that they are not identical. As the objection may be raised that the blocks from which these cuts were printed may have shrunk or swollen in the interval

Hence any theory as to the priority of either edition which is based on the presence of breaks¹ in the cuts falls to the ground and may be discarded for good and all.

Now, if the woodcuts betray nothing whatever that might settle the question, what clue is offered us by the textual test?

In my opinion, there is but one slender bit of evidence which at first blush might seem to indicate that Beneaut's *Patelin* came first. Here it is: At vs. 855 Beneaut reads *quant il deust canter se meesse (sic)*, which, barring the obvious misprint, *meesse*, is good Picard, whereas Levet's reading, *chanter sa messe*, is not Picard, but good French of the Ile-de-France. Now, the tendency of early scribes and printers was to modernize, or to put foreign, dialectal forms into more familiar language, and not to restore or critically edit a text; but it is quite probable that Germain Beneaut, though in all likelihood he, like Pierre Levet, was a Parisian, knew enough Picard to be aware that in Picard they said *canter* for *chanter* and *se* for *sa*? In other words, in this single case Beneaut, or perhaps his typesetter, may have been critical enough to notice and bear in mind the following words:

Le drappier
Mais comment parle il proprement
picart dont vient tel cocardie
Guillemette
Sa mere fust de picardie
pour ce le parle il maintenant.²

between the appearance of *Le Roy's Patelin* and that of Beneaut or Levet (for there is no likelihood that Levet or Beneaut preceded *Le Roy*) we had best consider other features.

Beneaut's woodcuts, like his type, are blacker than Levet's and have broader lines. But other differences seem to indicate more clearly still that different blocks were used by Beneaut and Levet. For instance, in L, *Patelin's* foot rests on the lower border; not so in B. In B the Judge, as has been said, is cross-eyed. In L the bottom of the Shepherd's crook is further from the lower border than in B. The upper edge of *Patelin's* left sleeve is broken in B; furthermore, the Draper's left eye is larger in B, and his jaw is broken near the ear. On the Shepherd's waist in B is a mark quite different from what we find in L. On the other hand, the outer edges of the side borders are a little rougher in L than in B, but B has a break in the right upper corner which L has not. Now, if the breakage theory (see n. 1. p. 124) is worth anything, and if the other characteristics which I have pointed out have any significance, we must make this conclusion: Levet did not use either of the blocks used by Beneaut, nor did Beneaut borrow the block used by Levet, but either they copied or used blocks employed by an earlier printer in an edition now lost, or Beneaut made his two blocks from the cut in Levet, or Levet made his block from one of the two cuts in Beneaut. If such be the case, we cannot rely on these woodcuts to decide the priority of either. We must therefore appeal to the text.

¹ If either printer had borrowed a block from the other, the breaks would naturally have left the telltale blanks which Mr. Claudin calls "cassures dans les filets."

² Vss. 858-61, quoted exactly as they stand in *Le Roy*.

In Le Roy, whose *Patelin* is certainly the prototype, and probably the very text that either Beneaut or Levet copied, vs. 855 reads Quant il deust chanter sa messe. Hence Beneaut's *canter* and *se* must be due either to Beneaut's critical faculty¹ or to the highly unlikely possibility that he copied from an intermediate text now lost, and this intermediate text must have contained the Picard forms.

I have dwelt on this shred of evidence purely in order to present the case fairly, leaving no stone unturned, endeavouring to analyze scientifically every clue, whether it might speak for Beneaut's priority or for the priority of Levet. But here is one more witness whose testimony seems to me to prove beyond question that Levet's *Patelin* is the older text: Beneaut omits vs. 179, lung a laultre comme len fait. If Levet had copied Beneaut, how could Levet have given this omitted verse? Surely no one who is at all acquainted with the ways of fifteenth-century printers will imagine that Levet supplied the missing line out of his memory or out of some other edition.

Unless my argument is faulty, Pierre Levet, and not Germain Beneaut, copied Le Roy's *Patelin*, and Levet's edition must therefore have appeared between the year 1485, or thereabout,² and shortly before December 20, 1490.³ The most likely date is 1489. Yet, so far as textual criticism is concerned, it matters little; the exact year is of far greater importance to those who are trying to shed more light on the activities of fifteenth-century printers. In the firm belief that Levet's *Patelin* is not only the oldest complete edition extant, but that it is also the oldest extant example of a comedy, in a modern tongue, illustrated with woodcuts made especially for its sake, and not borrowed with little or no sense of their fitness, we may rest content. Levet's *Patelin* was no doubt looked upon as a mere chapbook in the year 1489, or thereabout, but it is now a priceless treasure; for not only is it

¹ Or to that of one of his workmen. Whether Beneaut set all or any of the type for his *Patelin* is, of course, unknown. MS 4723 gives *canter* and *se*.

² In the letter already quoted from (n. 1, p. 122), Mr. Claudin says: "No book of Guillaume Le Roy is dated after 1488, so it is certain for me that the Lyonese edition preceded the Parisian one of 1490."

³ Beneaut's colophon is as follows: Explicit maistre pierre pathelin || Imprime aparis au scaumō deuât le || patois par germain beneaut imprimeur || le xx^me iour de decembre || lan mil lillcillixx et dix.

a beautiful specimen of early printing, but it contains an excellent text of the best comedy written in Europe between the last work of Terence and Udall's *Roister Doister* (1552 or 1553), and from its perfectly preserved pages we can supply the 134 verses now represented by counterfeits in the only known extant edition of the *Patelin* by Guillaume Le Roy.¹

¹My edition of *Patelin* will be so arranged as to enable whoever chooses to do so to restore every letter of Le Roy's edition. In another article I hope to give a full description of the edition by Le Roy. Meanwhile we may be fortunate enough to get, either from Mr. Claudin or from some other authority, a little more definite information than we have now as to the activities of this Lyonesse printer.

RICHARD HOLBROOK.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

SCHLEGEL'S FRAGMENT "DIE AMAZONEN:" A DISCUSSION OF ITS AUTHORSHIP

Three dramatic fragments found among the papers of A. W. von Schlegel, were included, under the editorial direction of Eduard Böcking, together with the essay "Über das spanische Theater,"¹ in the posthumous edition of Schlegel's *Spanisches Theater*.² The implied ascription of one of these fragments, *Die Amazonen*, to Calderon by Böcking,³ and later also by Ticknor,⁴ has, in so far as I am informed, been tacitly accepted.

The following is a brief discussion of the theme and metrical structure of the fragment: The play starts *in medias res* with a cry to arms by the Amazon warriors. Their leader, Hippolyta, and the Greek, Bellerophon, enter fighting. The Greek falls, and the Amazon's hatred vents itself in the cry: "Stirb! erbleiche!" She is about to slay him, when her comrade, Antiope, in the full flush of a sudden passionate love for him, appears, crying: "Ich will, ich muss ihn retten! er ist mein." Like Kleist's Penthesilea, she will spare his life, "den Triumph zu zieren," and rejects the command of Hippolyta that she content herself with his armor:

Und ewig stumm ist ein entseeltes Haupt;
Es kann Gestalt und Antlitz nur des Helden
Sein Widerstehen und meine Kühnheit melden.

She admits that her protection of Bellerophon is prompted through love, but says:

Diess ist ein sonnenflammend rein Entbrennen,
Das um ein Heldenbild verklärend schwebt.

As they are about to fight for possession of him, an Amazon warrior brings the news that the tide of battle is changing. Hippolyta rushes away. Alone with the Greek, Antiope expresses a

¹ *Europa*, Vol. I (1803), No. 2.

² Leipzig, 1845.

³ There is no doubt but that Böcking looked upon this fragment as Calderon's. The single departure from the title *Schauspiele von Don Pedro Calderon de la Barca* is the fragment *Numancia* of Cervantes, which is duly credited to him.

⁴ *History of Spanish Literature*, Vol. II, p. 433, footnote.

joy, mixed with regret, that she has obtained her heart's delight:

Gefang'ne des Gefang'nen, kann von Wunden
Die ich dir schlug, mein Busen nie gesunden.

To this the Greek replies:

Doch von den Blicken kann ich nicht genesen.

Ja mit der Purpurquelle meiner Wunden

Folg' ich dir. . . .

The *gracioso* now enters and comments on his leader's action in the following lines:

Liebe macht ihn so verwegen,
In die Amazonenschaft
Ist er nach der Reih' vergafft;
Und drum sucht er gleich den Degen
Jeder in den Leib zu rennen,
Das heisst wahrlich nicht verblümt,
Wie es feinen Rittern ziemt,
Seinen Liebesdrang bekennen.

Then follows a pastoral interlude. The scene is in a valley. Mnemonia, the shepherdess, speaks at some length on the pleasures of pastoral life, the sentiment of which the following strophe shows:

Dank euch, ihr Himmelsmächte,
Dass ihr mich weihet einem stillem Lose,
Hier wo ich Tag und Nächte
Mit Nachtigall und Rose,
Mit Wald, Fels, Blumen, Sternen einsam kose.

She is surprised by the *gracioso*. Here the fragment ends.

Metrically the fragment shows the earlier *classico-italianate* manner rather than the blending from the time of Felipe IV. The line principally used is the *endecasilabo*. The fragment begins with it. In the semi-epic narrative there is the *verso suello* form, with pair-rimes at the end. The speech between Hippolyta and Antiope is in *ottava rima*, with full, as well as broken, strophic structure. That of the Amazon warrior is in *verso suello*, with pair-rime at the end. Hippolyta replies in alternating *eptasilabos* and *endecasilabos* with pair-rime, after the dramatic *lira* form. Antiope replies in *verso suello*, with pair-rime at the end. Bellerophon speaks in sonnet

form. The *gracioso* uses the *redondilla*, and the shepherdess speaks in the lyric *lira strophe* of Garcilaso. Barbelindo, a character that shows the realism of the Lope school, as well as the wit of the Plauto-Terentian, speaks in *versos sueltos*, at the close of which, with evident intent to ridicule, he uses a sonnet. The closing dialogue between him and the shepherdess is in *verso suelto*.

This fragment is not discussed by Schlegel in his lectures, nor in the *Europa* essay. He was at work on it when the first volume of his Calderon translation appeared. Friedrich Schlegel writes from Paris:¹ "Die Amazonen bitte ich mir sobald als möglich zu senden."² A. W. Schlegel writes Tieck from Berlin:³ "Mit den Amazonen bin ich noch nicht weiter."⁴ Despite the meager mention, the fragment must have been discussed and eagerly awaited by the Romanticists, as it is beyond question the initial impulse to one of the dramas of the period, viz., Kleist's *Penthesilea*.⁵

Schlegel's *Spanisches Theater*⁶ contains only Calderon plays, although we know that it was his intention to translate from other Spanish dramatists. This was due to Schlegel's demand that the Calderon plays should appear separate and not mixed with the plays of Cervantes, Lope, Moreto, and others, whose plays he and Tieck intended to bring out later in separate editions.⁷ He writes Goethe from Berlin⁸ that he will publish at Easter his *Spanisches Theater*, in which he will set apart the Calderon plays from those of the other Spanish dramatists. Schelling writes Goethe, April, 1803, of the appearance of the first volume containing the translations of Calderon's *La devocion de la cruz*, *El mayor encanto, amor*, and *La vanda y la flor*.

Work was resumed at once by Schlegel for a second volume.⁹ F. Schlegel in a letter from Paris¹⁰ comments on the first volume

¹ January 15, 1803.

² *Fr. Schlegels Briefe an seinen Bruder Wilhelm*, hrsg. v. Oskar Walzel (Berlin, 1895), p. 507.

³ September 20, 1802.

⁴ Holtei, *Briefe an Tieck*, Vol. III, p. 276.

⁵ *Anzeiger für deutsches Alterthum*, Vol. XI (1885), p. 200.

⁶ Berlin, 1803; Berlin, 1809, two volumes.

⁷ Holtei, *Briefe an Tieck*, Vol. III, p. 275.

⁸ September 11, 1802.

⁹ Letter to Goethe, Berlin, September 10, 1803.

¹⁰ November 26, 1803 (Walzel, p. 522).

of *Spanisches Theater* and urges Wilhelm, in the future, to select only "ganz katholische and fantastische Stücke." Wilhelm writes Goethe¹ that he is at work on Calderon "und in der Übersetzung eines Stückes begriffen, das vielleicht selbst nach vertrauter Bekanntschaft mit denen im ersten Band in Erstaunen setzen kann." The translation of this play, *El principe constante*, was finished by the end of the year, and Schlegel writes Goethe again from Berlin² that the *Spanisches Theater* will be rapidly pushed to an end. In his correspondence with Tieck, Goethe, and others at this time, as well as in his *Europa* essay, it is important to note that Wilhelm Schlegel insisted upon a separate appearance of the translations of other Spanish dramatists from that of his ideal poet Calderon; and, in his selections from the latter, one can further note a studied effort to select those plays which, in his judgment, best suited the German temperament, the interests of the reconstructing German drama, and the reputation of his prince of dramatic poets. In this connection he writes Goethe of *El principe constante*.³

By 1804 we reach Schlegel's point of greatest interest for Spanish literature, including even Calderon. Thereafter there is rapid wane, due, largely, to the awakened interest in the literatures of the North. In the Berlin lectures he had called Calderon as great a romantic type as Shakespeare.⁴ In the letter to Tieck of September 20, 1802, we have seen that he would no sooner think of putting Calderon and any other poet within the same covers, than of putting Shakespeare with Ben Jonson, Fletcher, etc., in the same binding in his *Englisches Theater*. The Berlin lectures are especially rich in illustration of his Calderon cult. He points to Calderon as a model for the drama of myth, mystery, and Christianity;⁵ and says that the study of Calderon is necessary to the mystic interpretation of nature.⁶ It is the time of his sonnet to Calderon,⁷ and of the interest for Spanish literature which prompted him to write Goethe⁸ that it was largely the lack of Spanish books which gave the Italian flavor to *Blumensträusse*, 1803-4. "Sollte ich einmal wieder," he writes, "solch eine

¹ October 15, 1803.

² January 17, 1804.

³ Cf. letter of January 17, 1804.

⁴ Souffert, D. L. D. 17, 18, 19, Vol. 1, p. 110.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 355.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 4.

⁷ *Werke*, Vol. 1, p. 372.

⁸ Berlin, September 17, 1803.

Sammlung geben, so würde ich das Verhältnis umkehren." In a letter to Goethe¹ he refers, in retrospective pride, to himself as Calderon's first missionary in Germany. Further, the letter to Goethe from Bonn² reveals the Calderon cult in his studied attempt "das Vergessene und Verkannte ans Licht zu ziehen" through Dante > Shakespeare > Petrarca > Calderon > *alle deutsche Heldenlieder*.

This shows us Schlegel's turning aside from Calderon. As early as March 12, 1806, he writes Fouqué³ from Geneva that Germany needs a different kind of poetry from the Spanish—one in which there is a vigorous, manly, militant, patriotic note in this period of social and political depression; that they should go to the Germanic past, to those periods of Germanic political ascendancy.

Schlegel's interest in Calderon is supposed to have come from Tieck, although his interest in Spanish literature dates from his Göttingen days. Schlegel and Tieck were mutually helpful. The former encouraged Tieck's *Don Quijote*, 1797–99, and was planning to bring out with him all of Cervantes, when they were anticipated. In order to create the atmosphere necessary to an artistically truthful attempt, they read, while engaged in this, from the Spanish lyric and drama. Of Tieck we read:

Durch diese Übersetzungsarbeit nun ward er bewogen, auch in der dramatischen Literatur der Spanier sich umzuschauen. Lope de Vega und Calderon studiert.⁴

Tieck turned from Genoveva, 1797, to Cervantes. From the final form, 1799, we see in its "Farbenpracht und Formenreichtum" the results of his Spanish studies, "vor allem Lope und Calderon."⁵

At this time Schlegel did not care for Calderon and did not share Tieck's enthusiasm for *Devocion de la cruz*.⁶ In the *Europa* essay he writes:

Ich hielt anfangs das für Manier, was ich nachher als den reinsten und potenziertesten Stil des Romantischtheatralischen erkannte.

¹ Geneva, March 15, 1811.

² November 1, 1824.

³ *Briefe an Fouqué*, hrsg. von Hitzig (Berlin, 1848.), Abt. 2, p. 354.

⁴ Koch, "Calderon in Deutschland" (*Im Neuen Reich*, May 25, 1881).

⁵ Haym, *Die romantische Schule*, p. 472: Ranft, *Tieck's Genoveva als romantische Dichtung*.

⁶ Köpke, *Ludwig Tieck*, Vol. I, p. 251.

At this period of the Cervantes-Lope enthusiasm the Berlin salons read the former with delight. For the great interest in Weimar one finds ample testimony in the correspondence of Herder, Goethe, or Schiller. This was due largely to the translations of Bertuch and von Soden. Of the former Farinelli says: "Er hat mit seinen Arbeiten zur Kenntnis der spanischen Literatur den Romantikern den Weg gebahnt."¹ Aside from Tieck's connection with the Reichardt house, his association with Rambach and Grosse strengthened the interest in Cervantes and Lope that had come to him from Dieze through Tychsen. Rambach's *Graf Mariano*,² after Lope's treatment of the Alarcos romance in Bertuch's *Magazin*, and Grosse's *Spanische Novellen*³ created at the time a great interest in Spanish literature and are potent factors in the movement to reconstruct German literature after the Spanish.

Schlegel's *Numancia* dates from this period. From Jena⁴ he writes Goethe that, among some books just received from Göttingen, there were two with which he has formed a most interesting acquaintance, viz: *Viaje del Parnaso* and *Numancia*. To Goethe he writes twice for the Spanish *Don Quijote*: "In diesem unseren Musensitze ist überhaupt kein spanischer *Don Quijote* befindlich."⁵ This interest in Cervantes, Lope, and the lyric of Góngora, Garcilaso, and Villegas, in particular, dates from his early friendship with Bürger and Heyne, the friend of Herder.⁶ To this period really belong the *Horen* articles, in particular "Briefe über Poesie, Silbenmasse and Sprache," an essay which is at the threshold of the movement to wed poetry and music. With the lectures of Bouterwek, who had been active at Göttingen in the interests of Spanish literature since 1790, Friedrich was acquainted as early as 1792.⁷ This must have been overlooked by Koch when he attributes the Schlegel-Tieck interest for Calderon to Bouterwek's *Geschichte der spanischen Poesie and Beredsamkeit*.⁸

¹ *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, Neue Folge, Vol. VIII, p. 325.

² Grätz, 1799.

³ Berlin, 1794-5.

⁴ November 5, 1799.

⁵ *Briefe*, Jena, May 30 and June 17, 1800.

⁶ Cf. Boie an Jacobi, August 28, 1767; Haym, *op. cit.*, pp. 145, 147, 869.

⁷ *Briefe* (Walzel), p. 49.

⁸ Göttingen, 1804; cf. *Im Neuen Reich*, May 23, 1881.

A glance at the literature of Spain read in Germany during the last half of the eighteenth century shows that Calderon was not so prominent as Cervantes and Lope. Cronegk had an edition of Lope. Herder in the *Fragmente* selects Lope as representative of the Catholic tendency in the romantic drama. Dieze and Schiebeler were lovers of Cervantes. The former defended Lope and Calderon in the strife over the merits of the Spanish dramatists, the latter awakened the interest of Gleim and Jacobi in Góngora, Garcilaso, and the lyricists. Bertuch translated Villegas in 1774, and emphasized the merits of Lope and Cervantes in his *Magazin*, 1780-82. The translation of *Linguet* by Zacharia und Gärtner, 1770-71, contained plays from Calderon, Lope, Moreto, Fragoso, Candamo, and Solís. Two other books of importance are: R. Becker, *Schauspiele nach spanischen Originalen*¹ and Buchholz, *Handbuch der spanischen Sprache und Literatur*.²

From Schlegel's reading we know that he was acquainted with Cervantes, Lope, de Mescua, Tirso de Molina, Guevara, de Rojas, Coello, Fragoso, Solís, and Candamo. I regret sincerely that I have not had access to the books on travel in Spain of Kaufhold³ and Fischer⁴ in the preparation of this article, since these books were widely read in the Berlin, Jena, and Weimar circles. Farinelli says that the former gives a better account of the Spanish stage than Schlegel.⁵ Schlegel had, however, but few books in Spanish at this time, nothing comparable to that rich collection which one must infer from the letters to Tieck from Bonn.⁶ The "Vorrede" to Bertuch, as well as the correspondence of Tieck and the Schlegels, show us the scarcity of Spanish books in Germany. Göttingen had perhaps the only well-equipped library. From this library, and through Friedrich's copying from and purchases of old books in Paris, Wilhelm Schlegel secured the books necessary to his work. Under date of January 15, 1803, Friedrich writes from Paris:

Spanische Bücher hat man hier sehr gute Gelegenheit zu kaufen, auch nicht sehr theuer. Mache nur dass ich Dir für die Europa recht

¹ Dresden, 1783; cf. *Europa*, Vol. I, No. 2.

² Berlin, 1801-4.

³ Gotha, 1797.

⁴ Berlin, 1799.

⁵ *Zeitschr. f. vgl. Litgesch.*, N. F., Vol. VIII, p. 358.

⁶ May 27, 1836, (Holtei, Vol. III, p. 301).

viel zu bezahlen habe, so kann ich es vielleicht in eitel Poesie abtragen.¹

Of particular interest is the edition of Garcilaso, which we know from the letter of August 14, 1803, was purchased for Wilhelm by Friedrich, at the time the former was working on *Die Amazonen*. In Wilhelm's library is found, No. 978, the edition: "Obras de Garcilaso de la Vega ilustradas con notas," Madrid, 1796."

By this time Tieck had commenced his Spanish library, to which Schlegel had access. The two editions most used were the "Apontes" Calderon, 1760-63, and the *Teatro Español de la Huerta*, 1785. Friedrich had written concerning these editions in 1803.² From the latter Schlegel read chiefly. That his acquaintance with Spanish literature was beyond this we know from his regret that it contained nothing of Lope and his predecessors.⁴ Of the eight comedias of Cervantes he says that they are "in der Manier des Lope." His opinion of Lope was by no means such as we are led to infer from Farinelli in his monograph, *Grillparzer und Lope de Vega*.⁵ Through his feeling that the Lope cult begins with Grillparzer, Farinelli has misread Schlegel's comments on Lope's three faults, viz., lack of sequence, prolixity, and a useless display of pedantry. What Schlegel does say is that the stage was the best place where Lope might free himself from these faults.⁶

From this lack of artistic blend and harmony in Lope and his contemporaries, Guillen de Castro, Montalban, Molina, Matos-Fragoso, Schlegel turns to Calderon, establishing a cult that continues to this day in Germany. Through his interest in Calderon he gave up his plans to rework the plays of Cervantes, Lope, Moreto, and others.⁷ Friedrich writes him from Paris concerning an edition of Moreto, "Calderon's Vorgänger," as late as November 2, 1803.⁸ Of the Calderon cult in Germany Tieck writes:

Bald war Calderon der Lieblingsdichter unserer Nation geworden . . . das wahre Heil für die Poesie könne uns nur von den Spaniern und namentlich von Calderon kommen.⁹

¹ Walzel, p. 505.

² Walzel, p. 519, footnote.

³ Cf. Walzel, pp. 505, 524.

⁴ Cf. *Werke*, Vol. VI, p. 377.

⁵ Berlin, 1894.

⁶ Cf. *Werke*, Vol. VI, p. 383; *Europa*, Vol. I, No. 2.

⁷ Cf. *Europa*, Vol. I, No. 2; *Briefe*, (Holtei), Vol. III, p. 375.

⁸ Cf. Walzel, p. 524.

⁹ *Kritische Schriften*, Vol. 3, p. 213.

This remark of Tieck certainly justifies Farinelli's statement that Calderon was "den Deutschen vor 1800 ein leerer Name und harrete noch auf die Apotheose der Romantiker,"¹ but not that of Schack, that all that Schlegel says in his *Vorlesungen* merits no other name than an ingenious and eloquent apotheosis of Calderon.²

In a vein similar to that in his remark in the above-cited letter Schlegel writes as follows in the *Europa* essay: "Ich werde seine [Calderons] Stücke nie mit denen von anderen in demselben Bande zusammenstellen, und sie durch einen zweiten Titel absondern." The question now arises: Why did not Schlegel finish *Die Amazonen*? As a Calderon play it would certainly have been finished and included in either the first or the second volume of the *Spanisches Theater*, 1803-9, despite the presence of the *Locken Absalons* in Schlegel's *Nachlass*. The play was eagerly commenced. Its completion was certainly eagerly awaited by Friedrich and Tieck³ at the very moment when the Spanish movement in German literature was at its zenith. Aside from the internal evidence, the fragment is closely related to the common interests of the three men to rehabilitate the German drama through the imitation and adaptation of the genius of the Spanish. Their correspondence shows this in the above-cited places where the fragment is mentioned.

The doubt that arises as to the Calderon authorship of the fragment from a close reading of these places is certainly strengthened by Schlegel's own treatment and exclusion of the fragment, as well as by the use of metric forms in it which we know that Calderon never used. An examination of Schlegel's translations shows that he has been true to the spirit of the two languages, and, in so far as possible, has kept Calderon's meters and rimes. Goedeke says that his translations are models "für die Übersetzung, die das Original nach Form und Inhalt, nach Ton und Stil in deutscher Sprache dichterisch nachschafft."⁴ In his own words Schlegel, in this respect, thus excludes the possibility of the fragment's being a Calderon play:

¹ Grillparzer und Lope, p. 342.

² Schack, *Historia de la literatura y del arte dramático en España*. Traducción de Ed. de Mier (Madrid), Vol I, p. 32.

³ Cf. Walzel, p. 507; Holtei, Vol. III, p. 276.

⁴ *Grundriss*, Vol. VI, p. 7; Vol. VII, p. 580.

Bei Stücken anderer Verfasser wird eine nähere Betrachtung ausweisen, ob Vertauschung der gereimten Verse mit reimlosen Jamben oder gar eingemischte Prosa und hier und da Abkürzung dem Zwecke vollständig entsprechen, und sie sogar in einem vorteilhafteren Lichte zeigen kann.¹

In this respect, the fragment could have been by one of the Calderon school. This does not seem possible, however. Not only the rime and strophic structure, but the atmosphere of the play, the naïve but forceful character of the language, whether of the passion, buffoon, or pastoral moods, and the simplicity in treatment of *motif* and character, argue for a much earlier time. There is in this simplicity, classic for a Spanish play of this time, treatment so similar to Kleist's *Penthesilea* as to suggest that the fragment might be Schlegel's—one of those blends after the Hispano-antique and the Hispano-Shakespearian so common to that period. The fable is not couched in so romantic an atmosphere as in Calderon's *El mayor encanto, amor*. Schlegel points out that "Calderon ist die griechische Mythologie ein liebliches Märchen."² In want of so great a part of the play, one cannot compare *Die Amazonen* with Calderon's play. We have enough, however, to show the great difference between the Circe-Ulysses treatment in *El mayor encanto, amor* and that of Hippolyta-Antiope-Bellerophon in the fragment. Hippolyta-Antiope are of the pre-Calderon spirit, of the time of the glowing passion, whether of revenge or love, of Lope's *Machtweiber*. Such characters are portrayed by Lope with less of the conceits of Calderon, in a manner realistic and true to his plastic sense. Of him Farinelli says: "Meistens besitzt das Weib jene Eigenschaften die dem Manne fehlen und dem Manne ziemen."³

The legend is handled, despite its simplicity, more or less after the chivalric romance of Ariosto and Tasso. In this pre-Calderon period this theme was of peculiar interest, as is seen in the reworkings by de Soto, the eager rivalry of Lope, the *Isabela* of Argensola, etc. The dialogue is not, as in Calderon, adorned "mit ausgesponnenen Vergleichen,"⁴ nor does it show the unusual expressions and syntax of the Calderon school. The

¹ *Europa*, Vol. I, No. 2.

² *Europa*, Vol. I, No. 2, p. 81.

³ Grillparzer und Lope, p. 288.

⁴ Farinelli, p. 52.

language is more in the spirit of Villegas, Figueroa, and the Argensolas. Lope's sonnet "Á la nueva lengua" refers to a later period. The lack of *asonante* and stress of *verso suelto* is only of this earlier period and not until Calderon is there extensive use of the former. The prevailing form with Lope is the *redondilla*. The *gracioso* is the only character in the fragment to use this; with this character, however, the *verse suelto* is largely used. Of Lope's school, even Montalvan avoided the *verso suelto* as unbecoming and difficult; likewise Harsdöffer in his reading from Lope.¹ Of Lupercio Argensola Schack says: "Su lenguaje y versificacion se distinguen por su pureza, elevacion y elegancia."² His plays show such interludes as we find in the *Amazonen*. It is the period of episodes so introduced as to gain the approval of the critics, poetically beautiful and artistically clever, but weakening the dramatic unity.

In the fragment there is no metrical blend, as later was the case. The only departure is the broken *ottava rima* in the Hippolyta-Antiope speech. From Lope to Calderon one can see a studied attempt to simplify the foreign measures or to adapt them through artistic blend.³ Ticknor misreads this: "Everywhere he [Calderon] indulges himself in the rich variety of measures which Italian or Spanish poetry offered him."⁴ Of the earlier period Schack says that Spanish and Italian meters exist side by side

aunque al aplicarse no constituyan un sistema métrico completo; las combinaciones métricas italianas y especialmente las octavas que mas tarde ocuparon el puesto principal, dominan ya en el diálogo ordinario.⁵

In speaking of the fixed forms which maintained in the early part of Lope's career, he says of the characters of *De la Cueva* that they speak in

redondillas, octavas, tercetos, yambos sueltos, canciones italianas, quintillas y versos octosílabos. . . . Si á las formas métricas dichas se añada el soneto tendremos la versificacion de las piezas mas antiguas de Lope de Vega.⁶

¹ Cf. *Zeitschr. f. vgl. Litgesch.*, N. F., Vol. V, p. 163.

³ Cf. Baist in Gröber's *Grundriss*, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 466.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 479.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 90.

² *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 77.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 428.

The introduction to his sonnet by the *gracioso* shows, in part, the studied attempt of this earlier period.¹

The interpolated pastoral in the fragment is of importance for the solution of this question of authorship. This is in the *lira* form, introduced by Garcilaso, *si de mi baja lira*, a form that was affected at the beginning of Lope's career by Herrera, Fray Luis, San Juan de la Cruz, and the Argensolas, for mystic and pastoral moods. A notable example is the lyric, "*La vida del campo*" of Fray Luis. Lope's school was far superior to Calderon in "las innumerables composiciones líricas."² Shortly after, we find the *lira* enlarged in the lyric, by the blend with native measures; cf. Figueroa's *cuando cerro los ojos* and Balbuena's *que gusto es ver un simple pastorcillo*; and in the drama to the six-line paired strophe with alternating *eptasilabos* and *endecasílabos* that was later enlarged into the indefinite *silva* of Calderon. Schack writes of this as follows:

En los dramas mas antiguos de este periodo es frecuente el uso de la lira; en los posteriores, especialmente en los de Calderon, mucho mas rara, haciendo sus veces la silva.³

The interlude shows the pastoral cult of this earlier time that had received such rich expression in the *Galatea* of Cervantes, 1584; the *Don Quijote* episodes, 1605; the *Arcadia* of Lope, 1598; the *Pastor de Félida* of Montalvo, 1582; and the work of Figueroa, the *Tirsi* of Cervantes. This is the period of the final triumph of the Italianate manner and the ascendancy of the pastoral, which, tinged with mysticism, as we have seen, was to lead later to the beautiful conceits of Góngora, Quevedo, Calderon, and his school. The classic themes at this time in vogue were later set aside largely through the drama of native themes, but were revived by Calderon and his school, especially in the unsuccessful attempt of Solís to weld classic myths and native traditions, to romanticize his materials.

Lope's earlier dramas are largely pastorals. The plays of Guevara and de Castro have frequently pastoral episodes. Lope excels in the portrayal of rustic types. His *Esther* is one of

¹ For Figueroa cf. Ticknor, Vol. II, p. 312.

² Cf. Schack, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 348.

³ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 212.

many dramas to show a developed comic underplot between a coquettish shepherdess and lover, inwoven for popular effect. Of his skill in this, Schack writes:

El nunca pierde ocasion de ofrecernos estos personajes y de intercalar á veces pequeños idilios de este linaje en sus dramas historicas y religiosos, aun interrumpiendo el curso de la accion . . . nos deleita por los contrastes que traza entre la vida rural y sin afectacion con la de ciudades y cortes.¹

The *gracioso* of the fragment has, in addition to the buffoon spirit shown in the early dramatic eclogues, the Plautian or Terentian qualities of the pre-Calderon school. This combination we find as early as Lope de Rueda, of Sevilla—the home of the Spanish pastorals—praised by Cervantes for his *versos pastoriles*. The dramatists *del uso antiguo* failed, like Gottsched in Germany, to banish this type. With Lope and Calderon in particular, it refines and changes into the full-blown parody on or caricature of the master or social superior. In Lope's early dramas, however, this realistic type, a blend of Italian buffoon and pastoral clown, is found.

In any discussion of the authorship of *Die Amazonen*, about which so little is known, one must carefully consider the characteristics which it may have in common with the Spanish drama at the various periods of its development. At this writing, my own conclusions, I regret to say are negative. I cannot hold with Ticknor, however, that the fragment is by Calderon, and can here only express surprise that this error failed to cause comment in the very excellent works of Münch-Bellinghausen, Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Rennert, Morel-Fatio, Menéndez y Pelayo, and others. In this respect I have the support of the very able scholar, Professor Arthur Ludwig Stiefel, from whose note to me I take the very great liberty of quoting:

Sie haben vollkommen recht, wenn Sie sagen, dass Schlegel's Fragment *Die Amazonen* nicht von Calderon herrührt. Mir ist aber auch nichts im älteren spanischen Drama bekannt, dem das Fragment entnommen sein könnte.

Several things point to this fragment as original with Schlegel. Aside from the style, of which mention has been made, we have

¹ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 451.

Friedrich's keen interest in the play immediately after his *Alarcos* venture and at the time of the *Ion* and *Lacrymas* experiments. In this connection most significant is his sending to Wilhelm from Paris the poems of Garcilaso, after which the *lira* is formed. Further, the only places in the correspondence where mention is made of the fragment seem to point to Schlegel's authorship. While there precedes or follows the notice some mention of Spanish literature, this is simply through the common interest in Spanish literature at this time, as well as the Calderon studies and of the latter ventures of Wilhelm. In the above-cited letter to Tieck he speaks of the *Amazonen* venture in connection with other work in the spirit and after the form of Spanish poetry. It is true that the venture is associated with a preceding paragraph in which he calls attention to the fact that he has read and studied Calderon during the summer, and is not as far along—referring to the Calderon translation—as he would like; but the association is one of accident only.¹ Of particular interest in this connection is Friedrich's letter from Paris, January 1803:

Die Amazonen bitte ich mir sobald als möglich zu senden. Besonders auch den *Ion* nicht zu vergessen. Mein nächstes Drama ist immer noch nicht ganz fertig; auch ist es keins von denen, die ich Dir genannt. Wirst Du denn nicht ein romantisches Drama dichten? . . . Auf die Amazonen bin ich ganz ausserordentlich begierig; ich bilde mir ein, ich könnte sie mir einigermassen denken.²

The entire spirit of these lines seems to point to the fragment as original, and this conjecture is certainly strengthened by Friedrich's eager interest, as well as by his sending the *Garcilaso* with whose *lira* the fragment ends, at the very moment of Wilhelm's greatest interest in this. Again, my own comment on the use of this *lira*, as well as the character of Mnemonia, the shepherdess, receives added support in the following opinion solicited from the Berlin scholar, Professor Gustav Roethe, whose *Säcularstudie—Brenzano's Ponce de Leon*³—gives weight to his words in this field:

Ich gebe zu, dass das Gespräch zwischen Hippolyta und Antiope und der Monolog der Schäferin Mnemonia allenfalls auch Originaldichtung

¹ Cf. *Briefe* (Holtei), Vol. III, pp. 276 ff.

² *Briefe* (Walzel), p. 307.

³ Berlin, 1901.

eines deutschen Romantikers sein konnte: aber schwerlich A. W. Schlegels.

The theme had just as marked an interest *per se* to the Romantists as it had to the Spanish dramatists. Minor, for example, refers Kleist's *Penthesilea* to the "Amazonengestalten der Romantiker in Drama, Roman und Novelle." Schlegel could have received the initial impulse to the fragment, if original, from Lope, Tirso, or even Solís, but certainly not from Calderon. Of all the Spanish dramatists, the work of Calderon is best known. Cotarelo y Morí writes as follows: "De Ruiz de Alarcon y Calderon de la Barca conocemos por entero su teatro;"¹ and Professor Antonio Restori, of the Regia University, Messina, has kindly written me: "Io non ricordo che Calderon abbia trattato il suito delle Amazoni." The plays in Spanish, under the same or a suggestive title, have a different fable and treatment. In Solís alone is there a suggested borrowing, viz., the similarity between Lucindo and Barbelindo.

While I am inclined to the view of Schlegel's authorship of the fragment, I am unable at this writing to defend it beyond the argument hitherto cited in the paper. Unfortunately, I have not had access to a specialist's library in the shaping of my notes, and have not been in position, therefore, to follow up several conjectures. With the hope that someone may assist me in correcting this error of attribution by Ticknor, I do not believe the printing of these notes to be untimely.

If now, on the other hand, one assumes that the fragment is a translation by Schlegel from the Spanish, the original is beyond question by some writer of the pre-Calderon period. The drama must have come to Schlegel among some books sent to him by Friedrich from Paris or as a stray book from some other source, with the pirated name of Calderon on the title page, leading to a mistake similar to that of H. von Chezy in ascribing to Calderon the *Silberlocke im Briefe* of de Castro.² The fragment was certainly in no work of which Tieck knew or which he had in his possession, if we accept with Friesen that Tieck knew all the work that

¹ *Anzeiger für deutsches Alterthum*, Vol. XI (1885), pp. 193-203.

² Cf. *Tirso de Molina* (Madrid, 1893).

³ Cf. *Urania, Taschenbuch* (Leipzig, 1815).

Schlegel was translating.¹ I have not been able to find the play in any of the collections used by Tieck and Schlegel, in the Academy edition of Lope, nor in Barrera under the same or a suggestive title. Ticknor claimed to know intimately the *Comedias Nuevas*.² His ascription of the *Amazonen* to Calderon was prompted, doubtless, through the title *Las Amazonas* in Vol. IX, No. 3, p. 85, or in Vol. XLVII of the same *coleccion*, containing nine plays of Solís, where several titles are repeated. The former play is without author's name and, in Calderon's style, might easily lead to the conjecture that it is a Calderon drama. His failure to compare this play with Schlegel's *Amazonen* doubtless led to his error. Tieck's copy of this *coleccion* Schlegel did not know. His Calderon plays were taken from other *colecciones*.

If, in conclusion, the fragment is from the Spanish, the original must be by some one writing not later than Lope. Stylistic reasons, as well as Schlegel's statement, argue for this. In his *Europa* essay he writes: "Verschiedene Dichter, die zwischen Lope und Calderon fallen, kenne ich noch nicht genug, um über sie mit Sicherheit reden zu kennen." For this period, therefore, we cannot reasonably expect Schlegel to have sufficient interest to select a drama for translation. With the drama at the time of Cervantes and Lope we know Schlegel to have had a wide reading acquaintance, although Schack has written to the contrary.³ By which dramatist of this time the fragment may prove to be, should the original ever be found, I cannot say, but beg to suggest, tentatively, Argensola, Villegas, Lope, Gabriel Téllez, or, possibly, de Mescua or Guevara.

¹ Cf. Vol. II, p. 177.

² Madrid, 1652-1704; cf. Ticknor Appendix F, III, p. 579.

³ Cf. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 32; Vol. IV, p. 203.

GLEN LEVIN SWIGGETT.

UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH.

